

GEORGE WALLACE VERSUS THE POOR
 (By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

precisely the moment when his State troopers were smashing in heads of Negro demonstrators, Gov. George C. Wallace was deftly reaching for control of President Johnson's antipoverty crusade in Alabama.

Banded a "leftwinger" by Wallace, the young Birmingham lawyer who has been the guiding force behind the poverty program in Alabama is being purged. If Wallace follows up his purge with his own takeover, Federal poverty officials in Washington will be faced with this choice: Either turn the poverty program there over to the tender mercies of George Wallace or just shut off badly needed money to the State.

T is reliance on local leadership is the Achilles heel of the community action program, which in turn is the core of the anti-poverty crusade. In the big cities, patronage-hungry political bosses are muscling in. Much worse, Wallace-style segregationists are applying their deadening touch in the Deep South.

This prospect in Birmingham is nothing less than tragic. Believing that the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King's demonstrations in Selma actually strengthen Wallace's hand, embattled white moderates in Birmingham have hoped the poverty program would absorb the interests and energies of the Negro militants. But if Wallace does take over the poverty program there (or forces it to be shut down), Negro frustration will grow and trigger still more demonstrations.

The story of the Birmingham poverty program dates back to last October, shortly after Congress passed the poverty bill. Mayor Albert Boutwell, a cautious, nervous moderate who was facing a challenge at the polls from the Wallace forces, was leery of identification with Washington in any way. He ignored the poverty program.

That's when Erskine Smith, a young Birmingham lawyer willing to stand up and be counted for the Johnson-F Humphrey ticket, stepped in. He put together a biracial community action committee in Birmingham, went to Washington (accompanied by Billy Hamilton, Mayor Boutwell's assistant) and got his program approved.

But in recent weeks Wallace has become interested in poverty. He has formed a State poverty committee—illy-white committee, naturally—led by a Wallace lieutenant named Claude Kirk.

Moreover, Wallace put together his own poverty committee for all of Jefferson County (which includes Birmingham), consisting of the mayors—all white, of course—of the county's smaller towns. Leading this illy-white committee is Roy Wallace supporter Jess Lanier, mayor of Bessemer, which has one of the largest Negro populations proportionately in all of the South.

The Wallaceites made their move on February 25. Claude Kirk, the Wallace man heading the State poverty committee, denounced Erskine Smith as a moral leftwinger on the eve of a poverty workshop in Birmingham.

Smith then found himself facing the multiple pressure that is so often the plight of the Deep South moderate. Out of a clear blue sky, his two law partners informed him they were breaking up the firm and leaving him. The reason: Smith was "too controversial."

Worst of all, Mayor Boutwell capitulated to the pressure and asked Smith to resign as chairman of the Birmingham committee (on the pretext that Smith had invited in members of the Urban League, most moderate of Negro rights organizations). In sympathy, Negro members of the committee declared they would resign if Smith had to.

At this writing, Smith is expected to resign Friday. But other white moderates are trying to convince their Negro colleagues to stay on the committee and fight the Wallace pressure.

Only the ultranative believe Wallace is really interested in an effective antipoverty program. His sidekicks in Birmingham boast that their county antipoverty committee "is all red neck and no brown neck." Moreover, Wallace has barred the location of a racially integrated Job Corps camp in Alabama.

What Wallace does want is control of the poverty program, not only in Birmingham, but also in Mobile and all other Alabama cities.

That illy-white dominance of the program might choke off funds from Washington (as happened in one Louisiana project last week) makes no difference to him. While Lyndon B. Johnson is crusading against poverty, George Wallace seems to be crusading against the poor.

(Mr. ELLSWORTH (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. ELLSWORTH'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

**SOCIAL SECURITY INCOME
 LIMITATION INCREASE**

(Mr. ROBISON (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to raise the outside-earnings limitation now applicable to social security retirees.

As we are all well aware, the Committee on Ways and Means is currently engaged in drafting a wide ranging bill encompassing numerous amendments and improvements for the social security program. At this time, however, we still have no definite information as to whether or not the committee will recommend any modernization of the unrealistic as well as obsolete penalty imposed upon those who have retired under social security at the present time, despite the fact that they are able and willing and in need of supplementing their retirement benefits by at least part-time employment.

As we know, there is no similar restriction whatsoever on the amount that can be received by those other retirees fortunate enough to have income from other pension plans, annuities, rents, or dividends. I can fully understand why there is some opposition to a correction of this inequitable situation from those who do not want the older worker to remain even a part-time member of the labor force but, if we mean what we have been saying about eliminating poverty, I know of no better way to advance that battle than to permit—as I am suggesting—such retirees to earn up to \$2,400 a year before any deduction is made in their social security benefits.

My bill, therefore—similar to legislation that I have introduced in other Congresses—would increase the present \$1,200 annual ceiling without penalty to \$2,400, and it is offered in the hope that, as more and more of us join in support of such relief, some such proposal will be included in the pending social security bill.

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. DERWINSKI'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

(Mr. BOB WILSON (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I think most of us are agreed, regardless of party, that this Congress ought to act this year on legislation calling for a constitutional amendment to guarantee the right of States to apportion one house of their legislatures on factors other than population.

The urgency is clear. Most State legislatures will not meet next year and so could not ratify a proposed amendment. A longer delay might find that many States already had reapportioned. In view of this, many of us have signed a discharge petition to speed consideration of this controversial issue, which boils down to lawmaking by the judiciary.

It is an issue which deserves our prayerful consideration. It is an issue that goes deeper than the surface considerations of reapportionment, however important these considerations may be. What we are witnessing here is a step by the judicial branch along the same path toward central government that the executive branch has followed so vigorously for so many years. The Court held in its momentous decision of last June 12 that districts of both houses of State legislatures must be based substantially on the basis of population. Mere numbers. What I would call "computer logic."

But, of course, people are more than numbers. They have different needs, different hopes. You cannot quantify them. You cannot reduce representative government to a game of trying to guess how many jellybeans are in the goldfish bowl.

We are, fundamentally, a republic. And what is at stake here is our republican concept of government. And this concept will be weakened when the States lose the right to determine the composition of their representative governments. I would hope that this will be found to be the view of most of us.

Bull
AMENDING THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT TO ENABLE CAREER FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WHO LOSE THEIR JOBS BECAUSE OF THE ABANDONMENT OR TRANSFER OF GOVERNMENT OFFICES TO QUALIFY FOR FULL RETIREMENT BENEFITS IRRESPECTIVE OF AGE

(Mr. LINDSAY (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the

March 11, 1965

RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join other members of the New York State congressional delegation in support of legislation which I believe is needed if the Government is to be fair to the thousands of civil service workers who lose their jobs because of the closing or transfer of defense and other Federal installations.

The bill I offer for introduction today is both brief and simple. It amends the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide:

Any employee who completes 20 years of service and who is involuntarily separated from the service solely by reason of the abolition or relocation of his employment with the Government shall, upon such separation, be paid an annuity computed as provided in section 9 of this act.

As the act now stands, Federal employees having 25 years of service may receive annuities if they are separated involuntarily regardless of age. Those with 20 years' service must wait until the age of 50 to receive annuities.

This provision often works a hardship on the people involved. Permit me to cite just one letter I have received on the subject:

I am a handicapped person under 50 years of age with 21 years civil service in the Defense Medical Supply Center, Brooklyn. This center is being transferred to Philadelphia on or about July 1965. Due to the ill health of my parents, who are my dependents, I am now forced to give up my job as I would be unable to make the move to Philadelphia.

As a native New Yorker who has given my best years to service in the Government, a 20-year retirement bill, regardless of age, would permit me to continue to maintain my home in New York.

In just three paragraphs, the letter typifies the effect upon individuals of the closing and consolidations of Federal offices throughout the country. During the past 4 years the administration has eliminated 149,000 Government positions. The Defense Department alone has announced plans to close some 95 installations. The problem is by no means confined to New York State.

I wish to make it clear that this bill would directly affect only career civil service workers—in other words, those with 20 years of service. Those employees who do not have a tenure of 20 years will, as present, have to wait until they are 62 to receive retirement benefits.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, this bill represents a conscientious effort to minimize the effects of governmental consolidations upon the lives of those Government employees who have served their country long and dutifully.

OFFICE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

(Mr. GOODELL (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in sponsoring a proposal to create an Office of Community Development in the executive office of the President.

In doing so, I want to pay tribute to

the work of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], and the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER].

These distinguished Republican Members have led the way in preparing this legislative milestone. I commend them for their constructive and dynamic efforts.

The changing tide of human activity, Mr. Speaker, demands this legislation. Our urban areas are growing across the face of America. The problems of the metropolis and the small city are growing in like fashion. This legislation can do much to meet, to ease and to solve these problems.

I urge the entire membership to carefully consider this plan. I suggest it should be promptly enacted into law.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE PROGRAM CUTBACKS

(Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, our North Dakota Legislature is very much concerned about the plans of President Johnson's Great Society to do away with the fine programs the Soil Conservation Service has had for aiding our farmers in the vital field of soil and water conservation.

These funds have yielded great returns to generations yet unborn in the preservation of our most precious heritage, the soil, and our legislature firmly resists the ridiculous and ruinous cutbacks requested by the President.

I am including in my remarks for the information of my colleagues House Concurrent Resolution B2 and House Concurrent Resolution W1.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION B2

A concurrent resolution requesting the Secretary of Agriculture and the U.S. Congress to take all possible steps to secure restoration of funds cut from soil conservation and agricultural stabilization and conservation budgets

Whereas the Congress of the United States has for nearly 30 years followed a policy of making Soil Conservation Service technical assistance available without charge to private landowners; and

Whereas the availability of such technical assistance has been of great value in the restoration and conservation of our natural resources; and

Whereas conservation work in the field of tree planting and water impoundments has been of particularly great benefit; and

Whereas much work remains to be done in the field of soil and water conservation; and

Whereas the Federal Bureau of the Budget has recommended sharp reductions in funds for technical assistance and cost-sharing aid in the conservation field: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the Secretary of Agriculture and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully urged to take all possible steps to secure the restoration of funds cut from soil conservation and

agricultural stabilization and conservation budgets, in order that conservation work, particularly in the areas of tree planting and water impoundment and similar-type projects, may continue at not less than their past level; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture and to each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

ARTHUR A. LINK,
Speaker of the House.
DONNELL HAUGEN,
Chief Clerk of the House.
CHARLES TIGHE,
President of the Senate.
GERALD L. STAIR,
Secretary of the Senate.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION W1

A concurrent resolution opposing proposed charges by the Federal Government for technical assistance to landowners in the field of soil and water conservation

Whereas the Bureau of the Budget has proposed that soil conservation districts charge farmers, ranchers, and other landowners up to 50 percent of the cost of technical assistance furnished to help design, lay out, and install soil and water conservation practices on their land; and

Whereas 70 locally governed soil conservation districts in North Dakota which cover the total land area have over a period of years made a most valuable contribution to the agricultural welfare of the State; and

Whereas the burden of such payments to the Federal Government will fall heaviest on our family farms and small operators; and

Whereas such assessment of payment to the Federal Government will discourage the application of soil and water conservation measures on land so vital to the strength and welfare of North Dakota and the Nation; and

Whereas requiring farmers and ranchers to pay the Federal Government for such services would place an added drain on the resources of rural America and force more people off the land; and

Whereas the Federal Government has for some 30 years provided technical help to owners and operators of privately owned lands because it is in the total public interest, and because one of the most urgent national needs is to protect and improve soil and water resources on the privately owned and operated land of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the legislative assembly of the State of North Dakota vigorously opposes any reduction in the Federal participation in such program and the adoption by the Congress of the United States of any system of charging farmers and ranchers for technical help for the application of soil and water conservation work on the privately owned and operated lands in North Dakota and the Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation, the President of the U.S. Senate, and the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives.

ARTHUR A. LINK,
Speaker of the House.
DONNELL HAUGEN,
Chief Clerk of the House.
CHARLES TIGHE,
President of the Senate.
GERALD L. STAIR,
Secretary of the Senate.

TIME TO CLIP WINGS OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

(Mr. LANGEN (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the

June 21, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

13597

ceding the filing of the petition in bankruptcy, transferred, removed, destroyed, or concealed, or permitted to be removed, destroyed, or concealed, any of his property with intent to hinder, delay, or defraud his creditors; or (5) in a proceeding under this Act commenced within six years prior to the date of the filing of the petition in bankruptcy has been granted a discharge, or had a composition or an arrangement by way of composition or a wage earner's plan by way of composition confirmed under this Act; or (6) in the course of a proceeding under this Act refused to obey any lawful order of, or to answer a material question approved by, the court; or (7) has failed to explain satisfactorily a loss of assets or deficiency of assets to meet his liabilities; or (8) has failed to pay the filing fees required to be paid by this Act in full: *Provided*, That if, upon the hearing of an objection to a discharge, the objector shall show to the satisfaction of the court that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the bankrupt has committed any of the acts which, under this subdivision, entitle him to his discharge in bankruptcy, then the burden of proving that he has not committed any of such acts shall be upon the bankrupt."

The bill as ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGNATION OF BENEFICIARIES UNDER CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND GROUP LIFE INSURANCE LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 432) to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 and the Civil Service Retirement Act with regard to filing designation of beneficiary, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first item of the order of precedence in section 4 of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2093), is amended to read as follows:

"First, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries as the employee may have designated by a signed and witnessed writing received prior to death in the employing office or, if insured because of receipt of annuity or of benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act as provided in section 6(b) or 6(c) of this Act, in the Commission. For this purpose, a designation, change, or cancellation of beneficiary in a will or other document not so executed and filed shall have no force or effect;"

Sec. 2. The first item of the order of precedence in section 11(c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2261 (c)), is amended to read as follows:

"First, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries as the employee or Member may have designated by a signed and witnessed writing received in the Commission prior to his death. For this purpose, a designation, change, or cancellation of beneficiary in a will or other document not so executed and filed shall have no force or effect;"

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PERMIT FARMERS IN DISASTER AREAS TO COMPLY WITH ACREAGE REDUCTION AGREEMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8620) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, to take into consideration floods and other natural disasters in reference to the feed grains, cotton, and wheat programs for 1965.

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF SCIENTIFIC UNIONS AND CERTAIN ASSOCIATED UNIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8862) to amend the act of August 7, 1935, to increase the authorized annual share of the United States as an adhering member of the International Council of Scientific Unions and Associated Unions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to interrogate the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. The author of the bill is not present, but I would be glad to answer any questions the gentleman wishes to ask.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I note by the bill that Russia and the Iron Curtain countries belong to this scientific organization, and the idea of this scientific group is to exchange scientific knowledge among themselves.

I would like to inquire: Does the gentleman know whether the Iron Curtain countries, particularly the Soviet Union, are contributing to this Nation and the other nations their scientific information in return for what we are giving them?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, on matters such as space and oceanography, information is exchanged, but only so far as is consistent with national security.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I understand the gentleman to say that the Soviet Union is cooperating. I am particularly interested in space, and whether they are giving us the advantage of the technology of space which we may acquire?

Mr. MORGAN. The hearings will show, I think, there has been much in the way of new scientific study, and that there have been some very high-level discussions on space.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Then the gentleman would say if we increase the appropriation it will facilitate the free world giving free information to Russia and to the Iron Curtain countries,

and that we will get similar information from the Iron Curtain countries?

Mr. MORGAN. The International Council of Scientific Unions was established in 1931. We actually became a member in 1935. I think the record will show that there has been free discussion of scientific information and a highly useful degree of collaboration among the members.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This expenditure has gone from \$28,000 to \$65,000?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, that is correct. The \$65,000 limitation was established in 1958.

Mr. GROSS. Now you want to make it \$100,000. In the gentleman's opinion, is this not a pretty stiff increase in a matter of 10 years or less?

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman is a member of the committee. He knows this is a long-range authorization. They would not expect to reach the \$100,000 figure until approximately 1968 or 1970.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman see any end to increased spending on this organization?

Mr. MORGAN. This is a very valuable organization, in my opinion. This country has benefited much by its membership and attendance at its meetings. We have received scientific data that was very valuable in several fields, and especially now in the space age.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think the brakes ought to be applied to certain of these international organizations and the increased donations that are being made to them?

Mr. MORGAN. Of course, the gentleman knows that space exploration is very expensive, and with the increased information we are receiving, the increase in dues, I think, is justified.

Mr. GROSS. I wish I could agree with the gentleman, but I cannot.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of August 7, 1935 (22 U.S.C. 274), is amended by striking out "\$65,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$100,000".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar today.

PROVIDING PENALTIES FOR THE ASSASSINATION OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules

and pass the bill (H.R. 6097) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for the assassination of the President or the Vice President, and for other purposes, with amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately following section 1734 thereof, a new chapter, as follows:

"CHAPTER 84.—PRESIDENTIAL ASSASSINATION, KIDNAPING, AND ASSAULT

"§ 1751. Presidential assassination, kidnaping, and assault; penalties

"(a) Whoever kills any individual who is the President of the United States, the President-elect, the Vice President, or, if there is no Vice President, the officer next in the order of succession to the office of President of the United States, the Vice-President-elect, or any individual who is acting as President under the Constitution and laws of the United States, shall be punished as provided by sections 1111 and 1112 of this title.

"(b) Whoever kidnaps any individual designated in subsection (a) of this section shall be punished (1) by imprisonment for any term of years or for life, or (2) by death or imprisonment for any term of years or for life, if death results to such individual.

"(c) Whoever attempts to kill or kidnap any individual designated in subsection (a) of this section shall be punished by imprisonment for any term of years or for life.

"(d) If two or more persons conspire to kill or kidnap any individual designated in subsection (a) of this section and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be punished (1) by imprisonment for any term of years or for life, or (2) by death or imprisonment for any term of years or for life, if death results to such individual.

"(e) Whoever assaults any person designated in subsection (a) of this section shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

"(f) The term 'President-elect' and 'Vice-President-elect' as used in this section shall mean such persons as are the apparent successful candidates for the offices of President and Vice President, respectively, as ascertained from the results of the general elections held to determine the electors of President and Vice President in accordance with title 3, United States Code, sections 1 and 2.

"(g) The Attorney General of the United States, in his discretion, is authorized to pay an amount not to exceed \$100,000 for information and services concerning a violation of this section. Any officer or employee of the United States or of any State or local government who furnishes information or renders service in the performance of his official duties shall not be eligible for payment under this subsection.

"(h) If Federal investigative or prosecutive jurisdiction is asserted for a violation of this section, such assertion shall preclude the exercise of jurisdiction by a State or local authority, under any applicable State or local law, to such extent as the Attorney General of the United States shall direct."

Sec. 2. Subsection (c) of section 3486 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the words "in any case or proceeding before any grand jury or court of the United States" the following: "involving any violation of section 1751 of title 18 of the United States Code, or."

Sec. 3. The table of contents to "PART I.—CRIMES" of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after

"83. Postal Service..... 1691"

a new chapter reference as follows:

"84. Presidential assassination, kidnaping, and assault..... 1751".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 6097, would make certain acts endangering the life and safety of the President and Vice President of the United States, or their immediate successors, Federal crimes. It would authorize Federal investigative and prosecutive jurisdiction and thereby facilitate the apprehension of the assassins.

In the past century, 20 men have served this Nation as Chief Executive. Four have died by assassins' bullets. Another, and a President-elect, were assassins' targets. Ironically, however, these acts are not crimes under the Federal law. There was no Federal criminal jurisdiction with respect to assassination of President Kennedy on November 22, 1963. Curiously, the Congress has legislated in other ways to protect the safety of the Chief Executive and other Federal officers but has never made the murder of or an attack upon the President a Federal crime.

Under existing law, the murder of Federal judges, U.S. attorneys, as well as Internal Revenue Service agents, employees of the National Park Service, and many other designated lesser Federal officials is a Federal crime. Indeed, the Secret Service agents whose duty it is to protect the life and safety of the President are covered under the Federal law, but the Chief Executive, whom these officials protect, is not within the framework of Federal protection.

Further, under existing law, it is a Federal crime to mail a threat to harm the President—18 U.S.C. 871—but not to kill him. It is also a Federal crime if two or more persons conspire to injure the President on account of his performance of duty—18 U.S.C. 372—but not if one person acting alone commits the homicide. In addition, advocacy of the overthrow of the Government by assassination of any of its officers—18 U.S.C. 2385—is a Federal crime. Notwithstanding these various criminal provisions covering lesser officials in the Federal service, and covering acts other than the murder of the President, the Federal law today fails to assure full and complete Federal investigative and prosecutive jurisdiction over all acts designed to harm the Chief Executive of the United States.

H.R. 6097, as amended by the Committee on the Judiciary, makes punishable the assassination, kidnaping, or assaulting of the President, the Vice President, and in the absence of the Vice President, the officer next in line of succession. The bill also applies to any individual acting as President under the Constitution and laws of the United States, and during the period between election and inauguration, to the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect. In the opinion of the committee, restricting the coverage of this measure to these

designated officials, makes it unnecessary to require that the hostile act occur while the victim is engaged in, or because of, the performance of official duties. The injury and disruption suffered by the Nation resulting from an attack on any of these officers plainly does not bear any relationship to the activities of the victim at the time of the assault nor to the motive of the assailant. The grave national consequence of the assassination of any of the officials specified in the bill certainly affords the U.S. Government ample power to act for its own protection.

In addition, the bill would punish attempts and conspiracies to assault or kidnap the President, the Vice President, or their immediate successors. Subsection (g) of the bill authorizes the Attorney General to pay rewards not to exceed \$100,000 for information and services concerning any violation of the bill. A provision in this measure amends the general immunity statute by making provisions of that statute—section 3486, title 18, United States Code—applicable to grand jury or court proceedings involving any violation of the bill. Although reluctant to expand the immunity provisions, the committee is anxious to provide the Federal Government with every conceivable investigative weapon that might be of assistance in protecting the life of the President.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is making an important statement.

I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Without objection, a call of the House is ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 144]		
Abernethy	Duncan, Tenn.	Gluczynski
Adams	Edwards, Calif.	Landrum
Andrews	Ellsworth	Leggett
N. Dak.	Evans, Colo.	Lennon
Arends	Farnsley	Endsley
Ashbrook	Fascel	Long, Md.
Baring	Fino	Love
Bates	Fogarty	McCarthy
Belcher	Ford	McDowell
Bolling	Gerald R.	McEwen
Bonner	Fraser	McVicker
Bow	Frelinghuysen	Mackie
Brademas	Glaimo	Martin, Mass.
Bray	Goodell	May
Brock	Grabowski	Miller
Broomfield	Green, Pa.	Minshall
Brown, Calif.	Griffin	Mosher
Brown, Ohio	Gubser	Moss
Cahill	Gurney	Multer
Casey	Hall	Nedzi
Celler	Hardy	Nix
Chamberlain	Harris	Olsen, Mont.
Clark	Harvey, Ind.	Pepper
Cleveland	Hawkins	Philbin
Colmer	Hays	Pike
Conable	Hébert	Pirnie
Conyers	Hicks	Pucinski
Cooley	Holland	Quillen
Corbett	Horton	Randall
Cramer	Hungate	Reid, Ill.
Culver	Irwin	Reifel
Cunningham	Jennings	Resnick
Curtin	Joelson	Reuss
Devine	Johnson, Okla.	Rivers, Alaska
Dickinson	Karh	Rivers, S.C.
Diggs	Keith	Rogers, Tex.
Dulski	Kelly	Roncalio

August 25, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

20887

presidential election year of 1968, and maybe will give the farmers and the Congress time to put together a long-range program that will work.

Efforts in the House to send the farm bill back to committee for extensive amendment were defeated on a 224-to-169 rollcall vote, with 211 Democrats and only 13 Republicans voting against recommitment while 110 Republicans and 59 Democrats wanted major changes.

When the bill passed on a vote of 221-to-172, there were 19 Republicans on the "yes" side, and 104 voting against. There were 202 Democrats for the bill, 68 against.

It is noteworthy that North Dakota's two Congressmen (one Democrat, one Republican) and Minnesota's eight (four Democrats, four Republicans) all voted for the bill on final passage. The Minnesota Republicans, however, had supported the GOP-led move to send the bill back to committee.

As for the wheat provisions, the omnibus farm bill takes one important step in addition to the 4-year duration. It raises the direct payment to farmers on a farmer's share of the domestic wheat market from 75 cents a bushel to \$1.25, with the 50-cent increase being paid by the Treasury. At the same time, it removes any certificate payment (or subsidy, as farm bill opponents call it) for wheat going into the export market. The changes should increase the farm income per bushel by 10 or 15 cents.

With the removal of the payment on exports, no longer can the farm critics contend that the taxpayer is subsidizing Russia or Australia or any other buyer on the world market. Wheat will move into world trade at the world price. Therefore, the elimination of certificate payments on export wheat might make it uncomfortable for the administration to continue the requirement that 50 percent of the wheat shipped to East Europe be shipped in American cargo vessels.

This requirement is a direct subsidy to U.S. maritime unions and raises the cost of wheat to the buyer by 10 or 15 cents a bushel or more, with the result that no American wheat goes to these markets.

If no export subsidy is to be paid to the American farmer, the U.S. Government in good conscience can no longer require that a subsidy be paid to American maritime unions—unions whose members do not even see the wheat until it is sold in the world market.

We believe it unfortunate that it was necessary to pay for the increase in the certificate payments for domestic consumption directly out of the Treasury. This system will keep the cry of "subsidy" rolling along, and will give the Bureau of the Budget a tempting \$150 million a year to try to prune out of future budgets.

It keeps the wheat price in the political marketplace, and there can be no solid solution to farm problems until the political angles are reduced to a minimum.

There was no great cry from the meat processors about protecting the consumer when meat prices recovered substantially this year. Yet the cry of "bread tax" and "pity the consumer" almost killed the farm bill last week. If the consumer cannot be convinced that the farmer is entitled to a fair price for his crops, how will the Government ever get out of the farm economy?

Even though the farm bill is through the House, it still faces opposition in the Senate. At one point, Senator MITCHELL R. YOUNG, Republican, of North Dakota, estimated its chances of passage as not better than 50-50. Perhaps the changes accepted by the administration in the House have eliminated some of the Senate opposition.

We hope so, because our farmers need the protection of this farm bill, and the breathing space it provides in our efforts to work out a long-range solution.

[From the Minot (N. Dak.) Daily News, Aug. 21, 1965]

WE BEG TO DISSENT

Fine gentlemen all, officers and directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis paid Minot the honor of a visit this week.

It is a pleasure to have them come, even when the conference is devoted to expounding what certain analysts say is inevitable in North Dakota.

The conference reviewed their interpretations of the changes taking place in North Dakota agriculture. The consensus seemed to be that they and everybody, including us North Dakotans, should acquiesce, accept it gracefully, and adjust to it.

Factually the gentlemen from Minneapolis told us nothing new. We who live here know what the changes are. We have listened to economists' analyses of this matter over and over again. There was nothing very challenging, either, in the advice that we should all acquiesce to bigness.

Here in North Dakota we are accustomed to adjusting ourselves to necessities. We may differ from the Federal Reserve bank men on what the necessities of the situation are, and on what is inevitable, and what response on their part and ours would be desirable.

What we in North Dakota have gained for ourselves in the past has not all been gained by climbing on bandwagons and going along with the trends. It is not inevitable, in our view, that North Dakota farms must keep getting larger and that all the little fellows must continue to quit. We know this is happening. It is partly the result of the direction in which agricultural automation is going. It is partly, also, because of the intentional or unintentional effects of compromised agricultural policy, which compromises Minneapolis business has helped to create, sometimes by its obstinacy. But it is happening, too, because of the present-day philosophy of Minneapolis business.

Business philosophy in the Twin Cities, as much as politics, has contributed frequently to sabotage of the worthy aims of Federal programs for agriculture. Right now that philosophy supports a point of view which may well result in North Dakota becoming an economy of big plantations.

In dealings abroad the United States finds it advisable to take a hand in the breakup of plantation systems. Yet on the domestic front we find leaders of business, by their thinking, throwing weight on the side of building an agricultural plantation system here.

We observe that food processing, food distribution, and food marketing in the United States has taken the primrose path to bigness. It is imagined that bigness goes with efficiency in almost every kind of business. Even in newspaper publishing, chains are gaining ground. No one needs to be reminded how finance is organized. So men in the food business and in banking may find it hard to understand why grassroots North Dakota would prefer to buck the tide against concentration in agriculture.

We wish some of the people imbued with the philosophy that efficiency through concentration is the answer to all needs would join us in our contrariety. If everyone now enjoying the benefits of North Dakota agriculture would respond to this challenge of the plantation system by saying, "No, we won't let this happen," instead of "Yes, this is the wave of the future," the trend toward bigger farms in North Dakota could be reversed.

We would have to concentrate some effort on gaining technological breakthroughs to favor mechanization in small units rather than big ones. We would have to concede it to be possible that small units can be made efficient in food production. We might

even have to admit that efficiency is not as important a goal in agriculture as happy families, and lots of them, living in the country and in small towns. It would help if people now benefiting from so-called subsidies and Government protection in their own businesses would quit pointing the finger at the one subsidy they don't like, which is adequate income guarantees to foster family agriculture on smaller spreads. It might be worthwhile for us to take this matter up with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, if Twin City business lobbies are going to keep thwarting our efforts to get a workable program through the Department of Agriculture.

Privately based economic study and propaganda groups, like the Committee on Economic Development and the Upper Midwest Research and Development Council, are quite within their rights in promoting the idea of the inevitability of agricultural plantations. But it is questionable whether a Government-related institution like the Federal Reserve bank should lend its support to a one-sided and, inevitably political, point of view.

LLM

ANNUITY INCREASES NEEDED NOW

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am pleased by the prompt action the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee is taking on legislation to provide much needed increases in annuity benefits for retired Federal employees and their survivors.

Mr. President, I have submitted a statement in support of the legislation to this committee, and I ask unanimous consent that my statement to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee be printed in the Record following these remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAURINE B. NEUBERGER IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 8469, A BILL PROVIDING FOR ANNUITY INCREASES FOR RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES, SUBMITTED TO THE RETIREMENT SUBCOMMITTEE, SENATE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, I actively support H.R. 8469 which passed the House of Representatives with a favorable vote of 395 to 0. This much-needed legislation provides increases in retirement and survivorship benefits for postal and Federal employees. I support this legislation and urge its prompt enactment.

Inflation is the greatest enemy of retired persons and this is especially true for a total of some 700,000 retirees and survivors of the Federal Government. The Consumer Price Index has risen by more than 17 percent since 1955. While Congress has been generous with providing pay increases for postal and Federal employees, much less has been done for the retired.

Retirees and their survivors need help now. A longer wait would find them in worse straits. Retirees as a group have a very short future. Delay while waiting a report of a commission to be submitted at some future date only works extreme hardship.

It is all too easy to overlook the needs of the retired and fail to remember that they were once active Federal employees who provided needed services for our country.

H.R. 8469 provides an approximate 11-percent increase in annuities to those who retired on or before October 1, 1956, and an approximate 6-percent increase to those whose annuities began later. A slightly larger percentage increase is provided sur-

20888

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 25, 1965

vivors—15 percent or \$10 per month, whichever is less—for survivor annuitants whose spouse retired prior to April 1, 1948.

Congress, in 1962, adopted legislation providing for automatic annuity increases based on the cost-of-living index. The mechanics for adjusting annuities to reflect living costs is improved by this legislation, and the time element shortened by using the monthly price index instead of an annual average. In this way annuities in the future will more accurately and promptly reflect the cost of living.

Annuity increases are desperately needed by retired Federal employees. It is inconceivable that when our Nation is devoting so much effort to the war on poverty retired Federal and postal employees would be neglected, and left to live far below the poverty level.

NINETY-ONE PERCENT OF PRESIDENTS OF JUNIOR COLLEGES SUPPORT COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the cold war GI bill, for the education of the returned veterans of the cold war period, from February 1, 1955, to July 1967—the end of the draft—passed the Senate by a vote of 69 to 17 and is now pending before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, where hearings will be held beginning August 31, 1965, with Congressman OLIN TEAGUE as chairman.

While the vote by which this bill passed the Senate was more than 4 to 1, the vote by which the presidents of the American Association of Junior Colleges of America approved the bill was more than 9 to 1.

The chairman of the American Association of Junior College Commission on Legislation, Dr. Isaac A. Beckes, president of Vincennes College, Indiana, testified for the cold war GI bill on behalf of the American Association of Junior Colleges. Bulletin 7b, a special report on Federal affairs from the American Association of Junior Colleges from its Washington office, dated August 17, 1965, contains this statement:

The National Education Association supports the cold war GI bill, as did Dr. Isaac Beckes, chairman of the AAJC Commission on Legislation, in a recent Senate hearing. A recent AAJC poll showed 91 percent of our presidents with views on it favored the bill. But it is likely to pass the House only if considerable public support is shown for it this year.

Surely an educational bill for the cold war veterans, that is supported by more than 90 percent of the college presidents of junior colleges of this country is worthy of the attention of every branch of the Government, executive as well as legislative. Justice should be done these veterans without further delay.

THE GOVERNMENT'S PATENT POLICY

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Senator Russell B. Long has long had a concern for the disposition of the public's property rights arising out of the huge expenditures of public funds. My colleague from the State of Louisiana is seeking to insure that what the Government pays be made freely available to all the people of this country. When the

public pays for research, why should the Government give exclusive rights to one company for 17 years, or any amount of time, so that it can charge the public a higher price for the results of this research than would be possible under competitive conditions? When the public finances such research and development to the amount of \$15 billion annually our citizens certainly should be the beneficiaries of the fruits of these efforts.

I have the testimony delivered by Senator Long before the McClellan Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights on June 3, 1965. His prepared statement contains much interesting and important material relating to the merits of this issue. Senator LONG's discussion of the subject, his detailed analysis of S. 789, S. 1809, and S. 1899, as well as his explanations of the international aspects of Government patent policy should be brought to the attention of all the Member of the Senate and the general public. Since Senator LONG's testimony will not be available to the public for a considerable period of time, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RUSSELL B. LONG BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, AND COPYRIGHTS

Mr. Chairman, although the subject of these hearings has been advertised as Government patent policy, it should be recognized that it is a misnomer. It is not a patent problem at all. It is not concerned with the patent system; it is not concerned with the administration of the Patent Office. The subject we are dealing with involves the disposition of the public's property rights arising out of the huge expenditures of public funds.

Also involved is the problem of insuring that the manner in which the public's property rights are disposed of will not defeat the objectives we are trying to attain in specific legislation. The only way to do this is to study each bill as it comes up to make sure that the disposition of property rights involved will help us achieve the purpose of the legislation. Each piece of legislation, because it has problems unique to itself, should not be put into a Procrustean mold in order to try to get consistency in the disposition of the public's property rights.

I. LARGE PART OF GOVERNMENT ALREADY COVERED BY LEGISLATION

The Congress has already legislated in many areas so there is considerably more uniformity and consistency than one might think. The following agencies or programs are already covered by statute and require title on behalf of the public, to the results of research financed by the public:

- (a) Department of the Interior: Helium Gas Act, Saline Water Act, Solar Energy Act, Water Resources Act, Coal Research and Development Act.
- (b) Department of Agriculture: Agricultural Marketing and Research Act.
- (c) NASA: National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958.
- (d) Atomic Energy Commission: Atomic Energy Commission Acts of 1954 and 1958.
- (e) Housing and Home Finance Agency: Housing Act of 1958.
- (f) Veterans' Administration: Prosthetic and Sensory Device Research Act.
- (g) Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Authority Act.
- (h) Disarmament Agency: Disarmament Act.

(i) Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (under Department of Commerce).

With the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Federal Aviation Agency following somewhat of a title policy uniformity is provided by these statutes in a large area of Government.

My bill, S. 1899, should be modified so, if enacted, would not override the special laws already enacted by the Congress. You will notice that under S. 1899 the AEC provisions are retained. This should be extended to cover more of the recent provisions. In other words, S. 1899 or any general bill should be operable only where an agency is not covered by any provisions dealing with the disposition of the Government's property rights. If any general bill should be adopted, it should be on this formula. In this way, Congress will be enabled to look at the substance of each bill to see what the policy should be. To the extent that Congress does not do this, then a general bill may be salutary.

II. DESCRIPTION OF S. 1899

The basic premise of S. 1899 is that inventions should belong to "those who pay to have them created." It is for that reason that section 3(b) of the bill provides that title to an invention shall be taken by the United States for the benefit of all the people of the United States if made in the performance of a Government contract. The premise is applied when according to section 2(i) the "conception or first actual reduction to practice" occurs incident to the performance of a Government contract.

This is the same principle which you supported, Mr. Chairman, as far back as 1947 in the form of the Kilgore-Aiken amendment to the National Science Foundation bill which stated:

"(d) any invention, discovery, or finding hereafter produced in the course of federally financed research and development shall whether or not patented be made freely available to the public and shall, if patented, be freely dedicated to the public."

It is recognized that in practice situations do occur in which both the Government and private industry have made contributions to an invention. Section 10 of the bill, therefore, makes provision for waiver of title by the United States, when it is shown that the equity of a contractor predominates.

In waiving the Government's property rights there must be effective protection of the public interest in inventions at all times. To accomplish this, no waiver may be made unless the Administrator has determined that: (a) the applicant for a waiver has made a contribution to the invention which exceeds the contribution made by the U.S. Government by such an extent that equitable considerations favor the granting of such waiver; (b) granting of such waiver would affirmatively advance the interests of the United States and would be consistent with the public policy declared by S. 1899; and (c) the Administrator has received a written determination made by the Attorney General to the effect that the granting of such waiver would not facilitate growth or maintenance of monopoly and concentration of economic power with respect to any part of the trade or commerce of the United States.

Another feature of S. 1899 is the proposed establishment of a Federal Inventions Administration, which would administer all Government-owned patents and make necessary determinations of the act. It would be affirmatively charged with the duty of protecting the public interest in scientific and technological developments achieved through the activities of agencies of the

¹ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 19, 1947, pp. 5472-5480.

Friday, August 20, 1965

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed military construction appropriations bill and adopted resolution on filling of position of Secretary of Senate next year.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 20426-20441

Bills Introduced: Two bills and one resolution were introduced as follows: S. 2440-2441; and S. Res. 140.

Page 20427

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H.R. 7596, providing temporary authority for increasing the number of officers who may serve on active duty in the grades of colonel or lieutenant colonel in the Air Force, with amendment (S. Rept. 634);

Fifteenth annual report of Select Committee on Small Business, with minority and additional views (S. Rept. 365); and

S. 356, private bill (S. Rept. 366).

Page 20426

Bill Referred: H.R. 9811, proposed farm bill, was referred to Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Page 20405

Military Construction: Senate passed H.R. 10323, military construction appropriations, after adopting all committee amendments en bloc, which were then considered as original text for purpose of further amendments, and a Stennis amendment to increase by \$2.9 million funds for military construction, Army.

Senate insisted on its amendments, asked for conference with House, and appointed as conferees Senators Stennis, Russell of Georgia, Bible, Ellender, Kuchel, Saltonstall, and Hruska.

Pages 20405, 20409-10416

Auburn-Folsom Unit: H.R. 485, authorizing construction of the Auburn-Folsom south unit, Central Valley project, California, was passed without amendments (motion to reconsider tabled) and cleared for President. S. 599, companion bill, was indefinitely postponed.

Pages 20416-20418

D.C.: Senate passed with committee amendments S. 1320, to strengthen and clarify the criminal laws of the D.C.

Pages 20405-20407

Private Bills: Senate concurred in House amendments to S. 69, 97, 134, 572, 1138, 1196, and 1267, private bills. These actions cleared the bills for President's signature.

Pages 20408-20409

Kennedy Film: By unanimous consent, H. Con. Res. 285, to allow the showing in the United States of the U.S. Information Agency film "John F. Kennedy—

Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," was taken from calendar and referred to Committee on Foreign Relations, which was ordered to report it to the Senate by midnight Friday, August 27.

Pages 20416

Printing—Secretary to Minority: It was ordered that the speeches by Senators in recognition and in honor of the 45 years of service to the Senate by J. Mark Trice, Secretary to the Minority, be printed as a Senate document.

Pages 20425-20426

Public Works Appropriations: H.R. 9220, fiscal 1966 appropriations for public works, was made Senate unfinished business.

Page 2044

Secretary to the Senate: Senate adopted S. Res. 140 electing Emery L. Frazier, of Kentucky, to be Secretary of the Senate from January 1, 1966, through September 30, 1966, vice Felton M. Johnston, resigned, effective December 31, 1965, and electing Francis R. Valeo, of D.C., to be Secretary of the Senate, beginning October 1, 1966.

Pages 20450-20451

Veterans: Senate passed with amendments H.R. 227, entitling children of certain veterans who served in the military prior to September 16, 1940, to benefit under the war orphans' educational assistance program, after adopting Miller amendment to provide that certain insurance benefits shall not be counted as annual income under operation of Social Security system.

Pages 20453-20454

Legislative Program: Majority leader announced that H.R. 9220, public works appropriations, will be considered on Monday, August 23, to be followed, not necessarily in order, by conference report on H.R. 7750, foreign aid authorizations, and then possibly by S. 1459, FPC jurisdiction over cooperatives. On Monday, Senate may consider H.R. 4750, interest equalization tax extension, and on Tuesday, August 24, H.R. 9221, defense appropriations, and conference report on H.R. 8639, State, Justice, Commerce appropriations.

Page 20452

Confirmations: Numerous Public Health Service and Air Force nominations were confirmed.

Page 20456

Nominations: The following nominations were received: J. Cordell Moore, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior; five judicial; and one to a U.N. group.

Page 20455

D825

D826

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — DAILY DIGEST

August 20, 1965

Program for Monday: Senate met at 11 a.m. and adjourned at 3:15 p.m. until noon Monday, August 23, when it will consider H.R. 9220, public works appropriations; conference report on H.R. 7750, foreign aid authorizations; and S. 1459, FPC; on Monday or Tuesday, Senate may consider H.R. 4750, interest equalization tax extension.

Pages 20452, 20453

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NCAA-AAU DISPUTE

Committee on Commerce: Committee continued its hearings on the controversy in the administration of track and field events in the U.S., having as its witnesses Delaney Kiphuth, director of athletics, Yale University; M. E. (Bill) Easton, president, U.S. Track Coaches Association; Asa Bushnell, secretary, U.S. Olympic Committee, and commissioner of the Eastern College Athletic Conference, who submitted a statement; Bud Wilkinson, president, Lifetime Sports Foundation.

Hearings continue on Monday, August 23

CIVIL AIR LIABILITY

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee met in executive session to hear Under Secretary of State Thomas C. Mann with regard to proposal by the executive branch of the Government to denounce the Warsaw Convention for Unification of Certain Rules Relating to International Carriage by Air.

SUBCOMMITTEE APPOINTMENT

Committee on Government Operations: Chairman McClellan announced that he has appointed a Special Subcommittee on Government Research, to be composed of Senators Harris, chairman, McClellan, Ribicoff, Montoya, Mundt, and Simpson. The subcommittee will be authorized and directed to conduct studies and hearings into the operations of research and development programs financed by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

MINERAL LANDS

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels held hearings

on S. 2358 and H.R. 7378, authorizing sale of phosphate interests of the U.S. in certain Florida lands, with testimony from Thomas Young, legislative assistant to Senator Holland, who submitted a statement in behalf of the Senator; and Michael Giller, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.

Hearings were adjourned subject to call.

CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEES—FREE PRESS AND FAIR TRIAL

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery and Constitutional Rights continued jointly hearings on constitutional guarantees of a free press and a fair trial, and on S. 290, making it contempt of court to publish information not properly admitted in criminal cases. Witnesses heard were William L. Marbury, president, Maryland State Bar Association; and Charles A. Moylan, State's attorney, Baltimore City.

Hearings were recessed subject to call of the Chair.

COPYRIGHT LAWS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights continued its hearings on S. 1006, providing for a general revision of the copyright laws, receiving testimony from Mark Carroll, Copyright Committee of the Association of American University Presses; Leonard Feist, Music Publishers Protective Association; and Harry Rosenfield, of the Ad Hoc Committee (of Educational Institutions & Organizations) on Copyright Law Revision.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT

J S W

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Retirement Subcommittee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported to the full committee section I of H.R. 8469, providing cost-of-living increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund. Subcommittee reported to the full committee without recommendation section II of this bill, which deals with retirement ages.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, August 23, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon. For program see Congressional Program Ahead in this Digest.

Correction—Iowa Contested Election: In the Digest of Thursday, August 19, it was incorrectly stated that a motion to dismiss the contested election in the Third Congressional District of Iowa had been received by the Clerk of the House from Stephen M. Peterson. The motion to dismiss was filed by the incumbent, Representative H. R. Gross.

Committee Meetings

SUGAR BILL

Committee on Agriculture: Continued hearings on H.R. 10496, to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

BANK MERGER ACT

Committee on Banking and Currency: Subcommittee on Domestic Finance continued hearings on S. 1698, and related bills, to exempt bank mergers approved under the Bank Merger Act from operation of the anti-

applicants for compensatory time off and at a rate of 1 hour off for each hour of overtime worked.

When an officer or member is authorized or directed to return to overtime duty at a time which is not an immediate continuation of his regular tour of duty, he is to be allowed at least 2 hours credit toward overtime. Overtime work performed as an extension of the regular tour, which, excluding rollcall time, is 30 minutes or more, shall be credited toward compensatory time off, unless such overtime work is performed in a second or subsequent appearance in court for which pay and one-half is allowed.

Finally, the Board of Commissioners, the Secretary of the Interior, or the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this act. Previous laws relating to holiday pay are coordinated with this act, and the act is to go into effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins not later than 30 days after approval of this act.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

At the present time, the act of August 15, 1950 (64 Stat. 447), as amended (District of Columbia Code, sec. 4-904(f)), provides that officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, White House Police force, and U.S. Park Police force may be compensated at the basic daily rate for each day of duty performed by reason of the suspension and discontinuance of their days off for emergency purposes. (A similar provision relating to the Fire Department of the District of Columbia appears in the act of June 19, 1948, 62 Stat. 498, as amended; District of Columbia Code, sec. 4-404(a)). Also, the act of August 15, 1950, as amended (District of Columbia Code, sec. 4-904(e)), provides that for each day a vacancy in a particular rank exists in the personnel strength of any of the police forces or of the Fire Department, an officer or member of such rank may voluntarily perform duty on his day off and be compensated at a rate equivalent to his daily rate.

However, these provisions do not cover the numerous special events and special assignments which require large details of officers and members of the various forces for crowd control. These special activities include parades, demonstrations, and traffic control at District of Columbia Stadium and other places of large public gatherings. During a typical year these details require approximately 140,000 man-hours of duty which, on each particular occasion, must be drawn (1) from the strength of the patrol forces, thereby depleting them and weakening their effectiveness in crime deterrence, or (2) from off-duty men, who are later unavailable for patrol duty when they are given compensatory time off. This drain of manpower from the normal patrol force would be relieved by using men working overtime for cash compensation to furnish manpower for these special events and special assignments.

An indication of the impact that special events have on the Metropolitan Police force is illustrated by the opening day baseball game on April 12, 1965, when details for traffic control and for movements of the President required a total of 370 privates and 65 uniformed officials and detectives; and by the demonstrations on April 17 against Vietnam policies when it was deemed necessary to require details of 551 privates and 54 uniformed officials and detectives.

During fiscal year 1964, the U.S. Park Police engaged in approximately 18,000 hours of overtime work. Of this amount, about 40 percent resulted from six major details which included Cherry Blossom Festival, Independence Day Celebration, Pageant of Peace, President's Cup Regatta, Press Club Family Frolic, and Schoolboy Patrol Parade.

The remaining portion of overtime worked by the Park Police was incident to court duty and demonstrations that required adequate police supervision and control.

The officers and members of the District Fire Department, in fiscal year 1964, worked approximately 6,300 hours of extra duty on multiple alarms, emergency communication facility repairs, and special investigations. In addition, approximately 600 hours of work were performed in excess of regular tours of duty for fire inspections, security matters, and related department activities.

The committee has been supplied information regarding the overtime pay practices of other major cities. These statistical data disclose that the enactment of S. 1719 will bring the District into conformity with many of the other major cities that already compensate their law enforcement employees for duty in excess of the regular workweek. Of 20 municipalities having a population in excess of 500,000, all provide some form of compensation for overtime worked; and 11 of the 20 cities provide for monetary compensation at a straight time rate or at time and one-half.

When hearings were held on this legislation the committee also had before it S. 1718, introduced at the request of the Police-men's Association and the Fire Fighters Association, which differed from the bill we now report primarily in that it provided overtime pay at a rate 1½ times the officer or member's basic hourly rate of compensation. Time and one-half was available under S. 1718 to all officers or members without regard to salary class, grade, or rank.

The Board of Commissioners, the Interior Department, and the Treasury Department either presented testimony or furnished letters for the record favoring S. 1719 and objecting to S. 1718 on the grounds that overtime compensation at a rate 1½ times the basic hourly rate of compensation was not in accord with the established practices of the adjoining jurisdictions or a majority of communities in the country at large.

The bill your committee now reports provides pay and one-half for those up through the rank of sergeant, but straight time overtime for officers, and escalation in benefits for both officers and members over the provisions of S. 1719 as introduced but somewhat less than the benefits set out in S. 1718.

The committee felt there were urgent and compelling reasons for adoption of a program of overtime compensation measured in terms of 1½ times basic compensation. First, such a program is not wholly without precedent but has been instituted recently in one of the most significant police systems in the country, the New York City Police Department. Secondly, and most important is the longstanding disparity between objectives and attainments in the strength of the police force in the District of Columbia.

Since 1961 the District of Columbia has been striving to bring the force up to the authorized strength of 3,000 men. It is currently 109 men shy of full strength. An additional 100 positions have been appropriated for fiscal 1966. Nearly 240 men will retire or resign from the force in the next year. The police department will have to recruit a total of 449 members for the force within the coming year exclusive of any needs the tactical force may generate if continuation of that program is authorized in March. In the meantime crime rates are on the rise. Accordingly, your committee felt that every effort should be made to assist the Chief in developing recruitment incentives, and views the enactment of S. 1719 as a concomitant part of strengthening the police department's personnel efforts.

The Comptroller General of the United States, in a letter filed with the committee relating to S. 1719, highlighted the competi-

tive disadvantage in recruitment facing the police department in an area where the vast majority of employees were eligible for and received compensation for overtime work at a rate 1½ times normal compensation. The Comptroller General remarked:

"One difference between the benefits provided by S. 1719 and those provided for Federal and District of Columbia employees by section 201 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, approved June 30, 1945, chapter 212, 59 Stat. 296, as amended, 5 U.S.C. 911, is that overtime compensation at 1½ times the normal rate of pay is provided by that section, whereas S. 1719 provides for payments equal to the normal rate of pay. We believe that the committee should consider the fact that the practice of paying 1½ times normal compensation is a widely accepted practice both in the Government and outside, in connection with its consideration of the proposed legislation. Also, section (g) (2) of the proposed amendment provides for the grant of compensatory time but not for overtime compensation when overtime results from the continuation of an employee's tour of duty."

While the Chief of Police has indicated headway is being made by the recruitment programs for the Metropolitan Police Department currently underway, the committee felt every effort should be made to bring the force to full strength as soon as possible, and, accordingly, reports this bill with the heightened incentive of time and one-half for overtime in the hope and anticipation that by making police recruitment procedures more competitive with prevailing private and governmental employment practices, more qualified young men and women will be inclined to participate in one of the highest callings and become respected law enforcement officers.

The committee feels further that it would be inappropriate and unfortunate to continue to provide a smaller measure of overtime compensation to a man who risks his life daily for the public good, than is provided for a worker in the comfort and security of his office. Only by paying a police officer time and a half for overtime work can this disparity between police and nonpolice Government employees be avoided. Obviously, such a measure as the committee now recommends will be of inestimable value in heightening police efficiency and morale.

Finally, and most important, this measure is the second point of the President's eight-point emergency crime fighting package for the District of Columbia. The committee feels that by broadening its benefits, this legislation will have a greater impact on the fight against crime.

The Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee on May 21, 1965, held public hearings on S. 1719. The District of Columbia Commissioners appeared at the hearing and supported the overtime pay legislation. The Chiefs of the Metropolitan Police Department, District of Columbia Fire Department, U.S. Park Police, and White House Police also appeared at the hearing and supported the provisions of S. 1719 as introduced.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, the following measures on the calendar call were passed over:

Calendar No. 775, S. 2572, a bill to amend section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended.

Calendar No. 776, H.R. 3141, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of

scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 778, S. 1446, a bill to reserve certain public lands for a National Wild River System, and to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that completes the call of the calendar.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet this afternoon. The full membership of the Foreign Relations Committee is invited.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, September 30, 1965, the Vice President signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 206. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the educational assistance allowances payable under the war orphans' educational assistance program, and for other purposes;

H.R. 728. An act to amend section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936;

H.R. 1274. An act for the relief of Mrs. Michiko Miyazaki Williams; and

H.J. Res. 673. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letter, which were referred as indicated:

ADMINISTRATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE AS A NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the administration and development of Pennsyl-

vania Avenue as a national historic site (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF EXCESS PERSONAL AND REAL PROPERTY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the disposal of excess personal and real property for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF PENNSYLVANIA LEGISLATURE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION 4

Joint resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

The General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby resolves as follows:

Section 1. The proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing as follows:

"Section 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

"Section 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

"Section 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

"Section 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

"Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as the Congress may by law provide, transmit within 4 days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within 48 hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within 21 days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in

session, within 21 days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office," is hereby ratified by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Section 2. A copy of the foregoing resolution shall be forwarded to the Secretary of State of the United States and also to the President of the U.S. Senate and to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives.

We certify that this bill, Senate bill No. 1001 printer's No. 1203, has passed the Senate and House of Representatives.

Chief Clerk, Senate.

RAYMOND P. SHAFER,

President, Senate.

ROBERT K. HAMILTON,

Speaker, House of Representatives.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment:

H.R. 10238. An act to provide labor standards for certain persons employed by Federal contractors to furnish services to Federal agencies, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 798).

By Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

H.R. 7484. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the rank of lieutenant general or vice admiral of officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force while serving as surgeons general (Rept. No. 807).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment;

H.R. 724. An act to authorize the transfer of certain Canal Zone prisoners to the custody of the Attorney General (Rept. No. 799).

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 3045. An act to authorize certain members of the Armed Forces to accept and wear decorations of certain foreign nations (Rept. No. 800); and

H.R. 5665. An act to authorize disbursing officers of the Armed Forces to advance funds to members of an armed force of a friendly foreign nation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 801).

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

H.R. 1805. An act to amend section 5899 of title 10, United States Code, to provide permanent authority under which Naval Reserve officers in the grade of captain shall be eligible for consideration for promotion when their running mates are eligible for consideration for promotion (Rept. No. 808).

By Mrs. SMITH, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 7329. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of San Diego, Calif. (Rept. No. 802); and

H.R. 10234. An act to amend section 1085 of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the reimbursement procedure required among the medical facilities of the Armed Forces under the jurisdiction of the military departments (Rept. No. 805).

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 111

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1965

No. 179

Senate

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, for the glory of the earth in the haunting beauty of which we walk, for the gifts of love and of friendship, for sacred and sunny memories of human fellowship, and for every radiant hope which inspires us on our pilgrim way, at the noontide of this new day, we lift our paean of grateful praise.

In Thy presence our arrogance is rebuked, our pride of opinion is mocked as we confess that left to ourselves we but grope in the darkness of ignorance, that our sight is dimmed and our judgments fallible.

As in this forum of freedom so many tangled problems converge which plague the wisest councils of men, may Thy servants here, devoted to the stewardship of public trust, be honest and honorable enough to follow the truth as it beckons wherever it may lead and thus to scorn all forms of pretense.

We pray that in these grave days of global concern in the affairs of nations that the instrumentalities of justice and concord which have been set up to unite peoples in the preservation and pursuit of peace may be the channels of thy providence, in cooperative endeavor to bring this fear-haunted, divided earth nearer to the ancient prophet's dream, "Violence shall no more be heard in thy lands, wasting nor destruction within thy borders."

In the name of the Prince of Peace we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, September 24, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler,

one of his secretaries, and he announced that on September 25, 1965, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

S. 76. An act for the relief of Anna Maria Helland;

S. 517. An act for the relief of John William Daugherty, Jr.;

S. 573. An act for the relief of Dr. Sedat M. Ayata;

S. 584. An act for the relief of Ming Chup Chau;

S. 614. An act for the relief of Evangella Moshou Kantas;

S. 1736. An act for the relief of Jennifer Ellen John Moj dara; and

S.J. Res. 5. Joint resolution designating the bridge crossing the Washington Channel near the intersection of the extension of 13th and G Streets SW, the Francis Case Memorial Bridge.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Robert R. Mease, to be postmaster at Springtown, Pa.; which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the following bills of the Senate, severally with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 306. An act to amend the Clean Air Act to require standards for controlling the emission of pollutants from gasoline-powered or diesel-powered vehicles, to establish a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory, and for other purposes;

S. 598. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist in combating heart disease, cancer, and stroke, and other major diseases; and

S. 1620. An act to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FALLON, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BALDWIN, and Mr. HARSHA were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7812) to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina, Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. PRICE, Mr. FISHER, Mr. BATES, and Mr. ARENDS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 7969) to correct certain errors in the Tariff Schedules of the United States, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of September 24, 1965, the following report of a committee was submitted on September 27, 1965:

Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably, with amendments, the bill (H.R. 9042) to provide for the implementation of the agreement concerning automotive products between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 782) thereon, together with the minority views of Senators RUBINOFF, HARTKE, and CORE; which report was printed.

24321

24322

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 28, 1965

AMENDMENT OF CONSOLIDATED
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION
ACT OF 1961

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider its action taken on Friday, September 24, in agreeing to the House amendments to S. 1766, better known as the Aiken bill, to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations, not operated for profit with respect to water supply and water systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I offer amendments to the House amendments and ask that they be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 12, change the subsection designation "(4)a." to "(4)(A)".

On page 3, line 18, change the subsection designation "(b)" to "(B)".

On page 4, line 18, strike out the words "Provided further, That no" and insert in lieu thereof the word "No".

On page 4, line 23, before the word "In", insert paragraph number "(10)".

On page 5, line 18, change the word "loan" to "Act".

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], to the House amendments.

The amendments to the House amendments were agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on concurring in the House amendments as amended.

The amendments of the House, as amended, were concurred in.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING
TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE
MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Long of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask the Record be corrected. On page 24210 of the Record of September 24, 1965, I was discussing the poverty bill, and at line 39 of the middle column I meant to say Department of Education rather than Department of Agriculture. I ask that the word "Education" be substituted for the word "Agriculture."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The correction will be made.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF OHIO
LEGISLATURE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S.J. Res. 18

Joint resolution to the Congress of the United States pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to return a portion of the income tax to the political subdivision in which it was collected

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Ohio, the House of Representatives concurring: That the Legislature of the State of Ohio, pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States, hereby makes application to the Congress of the United States to call a convention to propose the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Fifteen percent of the tax on the income of each citizen collected by the United States shall be returned by the United States to the State in which such citizen has his principal place of residence, one third of which shall be distributed by such State to the municipal government in which such residence is located if any, another one-third of which shall be distributed by such State to the school district in which such residence is located and the balance to be retained by such State for State purposes;

"Resolved further, That this application shall constitute a continuing application for such convention, under article V, of the Constitution of the United States, until the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall have made like applications and such convention shall have been called by the Congress of the United States, unless the Congress itself proposes the amendment herein set forth;

"Resolved further, That certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each House of the legislature of each of the several States, attesting the adoption of this resolution by the legislature of this State.

"ROGER CLOUD,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"JOHN W. BROWN,

"President of the Senate.

"Accepted July 29, 1965.

"TED W. BROWN,

"Secretary of State."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

H.R. 9022. An act to amend Public Laws 816 and 874, 81st Congress, to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster; to eliminate inequities in the application of Public Law 816 in certain military base closings; to make uniform eligibility requirements for school districts in Public Law 874; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 783).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

H.R. 1778. An act to amend the act entitled "An Act to create a Board for the Condemna-

tion of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; approved May 1, 1906, as amended (Rept. No. 784);

H.R. 3314. An act to require premarital examinations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 785); and

H.R. 5597. An act to relieve physicians of liability for negligent medical treatment at the scene of an accident in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 786).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

H.R. 9985. An act to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and hospitals or similar institutions in the District of Columbia of injuries caused by firearms or other dangerous weapons (Rept. No. 787); and

H.R. 10304. An act to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and institutions in the District of Columbia of certain physical abuse of children (Rept. No. 788).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 1314. A bill to amend the Street Readjustment Act of the District of Columbia so as to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close all or part of a street, road, highway, or alley in accordance with the requirements of an approved redevelopment or urban renewal plan, without regard to the notice provisions of such act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 791).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

H.R. 3141. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions and for other purposes (Rept. No. 789).

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 18, CIVIL
SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT, AS
AMENDED—REPORT OF A COM-
MITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 790)

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, reported an original bill (S. 2572) to amend section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, and submitted a report thereon; which bill was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar, and the report was ordered to be printed.

RESERVATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC
LANDS FOR A NATIONAL WILD
RIVERS SYSTEM—REPORT OF A
COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS
(S. REPT. NO. 792)

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report favorably, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, the bill (S. 1446) to reserve certain public lands for a National Wild Rivers System, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the minority

administration, setting forth, as official policy, the concept that the Government should not perform services and functions which can be provided by private firms. Regrettably, this document has not been revised in succeeding years. It specifically permits agency officials to purchase services from private firms even when they are far more costly to the taxpayers than the use of direct-hire civil service personnel. We believe this flies in the face of your administration's efforts to achieve meaningful economies.

2. End entirely the use of military personnel to perform civilian functions. This has proved quite costly in tax dollars, on the basis of the House Subcommittee hearings. Just a few days ago, Representative DAVID N. HENDERSON, the subcommittee chairman, estimated that at least 50,000 active-duty military men in our armed services are performing civilian-type work. This is detrimental to our defense posture as well as harmful to your economy efforts. Particularly in view of the serious military situation in the Far East, we believe these personnel could be released to combat duty, and their civilian functions—carpenters, painters, chauffeurs, typists, stock clerks, statisticians, et cetera—be returned to the civil service category where they previously belonged.

3. Repeal of the Whitten amendment, which has placed unrealistic ceilings on Federal agencies. The Council was gratified with your action of August 6, 1965 in signing H.R. 6622 into law. The new statute helps relieve a critical situation by exempting the Post Office Department from the personnel restrictions of the Whitten amendment. However, as long as Korean war-type ceilings are placed on other agencies—ceilings which do not take into account the additional demands generated by an ever-increasing population, and the additional services required by new statutes and expanding agency functions—these restrictions will serve as an open invitation to agencies to purchase untold numbers of man-years of service outside the Government in order to achieve agency missions. Procurement of these services from private companies results in far higher costs to the taxpayers than does the direct hire of additional civil service employees.

4. A review in depth of Defense Department plans to close or consolidate military installations. While there may be some activities which are no longer essential because of changing defense requirements, the Government Employees' Council believes that the determination to close many facilities constitutes false economy. The military hardware being produced at some of these installations remains vital to the defense of freedom, and the Defense Department will be forced to obtain this hardware from private firms. This will lead, inevitably, to greater expenditure of taxpayers' dollars. The Manpower Subcommittee has indicated it plans to hold hearings on the base-closure question. We hope the administration will join with us in a serious review of this matter before the subcommittee in the interest of sound fiscal management.

While welcoming this administration's efforts toward economy, the Government Employees' Council is concerned that it might be turned in the direction of merely reducing the size of the Government payroll. In years gone by, Federal employees have been the whipping boys for many a so-called economy drive, for it has long been popular to regard Federal employment as some evil that must be avoided at all costs. We are confident that your administration has no such thought in mind, but we are concerned that overzealous officials at lower levels in the executive department might construe the frugality drive as open season on civil service employees.

If this should prove to be the case—if the tactics at the agency level should be to slash

payrolls and then turn work over to private contractors—then the administration's efforts toward economy not only will be illusory but we will all suffer, for there will be a lessening of service to the American people and a marked reduction in its quality.

Let me once again pledge to you, Mr. President—on behalf of the Federal employees in the classified, postal, and wage board services whom our 31 affiliated unions represent—that the Government Employees' Council wholeheartedly supports your goal of a Federal establishment which will provide the American people a maximum of service at a minimum of cost. This has been the historic position of the Government employee; it will continue to be our policy.

Because we are most anxious to join more fully in the administration's efforts to achieve meaningful savings throughout Government, we look forward to an early opportunity for a small committee to discuss our proposals in greater detail with you or your designated representatives.

Respectfully,

E. C. HALLBECK,
Chairman.

A BACKGROUND STATEMENT BY THE GEC

The Government Employees' Council of the AFL-CIO has no quarrel with the private enterprise system on which the American economy is based. We welcome free enterprise; we concede its right to grow and prosper; we salute it for the enormous contribution it has made to the progress of our country.

We subscribe to the principle that Government should not compete with private enterprise. However, we do not interpret this to mean that the Government must be rendered impotent or that it must cede its duties and responsibilities to private firms. We feel that the Government has certain historic functions to perform, and that free enterprise has totally different functions to perform.

We believe this subject of competition should be a two-way street. If Government should not compete with private enterprise, it follows that private enterprise should not insist on competing with Government. We see no justification for an approach in which the business community says "what's mine is mine, and what's yours is supposed to be contracted out."

It would make as much sense for the Government to contract out to private firms the raising, training, and equipping of our Armed Forces—in the manner of the Hessians of generations past—as it does to say that the Government, to prove it is noncompetitive, must turn over to profit-oriented firms those duties that have been performed successfully by Government employees over the course of years. This is, of course, patently ridiculous.

There is no rationale for contracting with private firms to do the jobs which can be done cheaper, and better, through the use of direct-hire employees on the Federal payroll. If this present procedure is pursued further—particularly at a time when the administration is engaged in what it calls a war on waste—the American people are going to be misled. They will be told that reductions in the Federal payroll are being made in the interests of economy—but will they be told, as well, that to achieve this goal, more money is being expended to purchase the same services (or even services of lesser quality) from private firms?

The trend toward contracting out is the inevitable byproduct of restrictive personnel levels in the Federal service, aggravated by a policy directive issued in 1959, and still in force, which virtually commands agency heads to give preferential treatment to private contractors, as opposed to direct-hire employees, irrespective of the cost.

Bureau of the Budget Bulletin No. 60-2 sets forth the views of a prior administra-

tion on this question of competition between the Government and private enterprise. It states, as its credo, the principle that "the Federal Government will not start or carry on any commercial-industry activity to provide a service or product for its own use if such product or service can be procured from private enterprise through ordinary business channels."

In pursuit of this policy, the bulletin instructs agency officials to overlook even "relatively large and disproportionately higher costs" of commercial sources, and states as a general rule that agencies should have "a presumption in favor *** of commercial sources"—even, the bulletin says, when these are "more costly commercial sources."

This is a curious policy. It is a damn-the-cost-full-procurement-ahead concept. It may fit administrators' notions of how to get along with free enterprise, but it certainly is at odds with any high-flown promises about prudent management of Government affairs.

Yet, the policy continues to exist, and the Bureau of the Budget, which promised the House Manpower Subcommittee a year ago that it would revise the bulletin, still has done nothing.

When you add to this bulletin the unrealistic ceilings on personnel with which Government agencies are saddled by the Whitten amendment, you create the kind of situation that agency administrators must find hard to resist. On the other hand, you have increasing demands for services from departments and agencies of Government; on the other hand, you have strict directives on the number of people you are allowed. Increased efficiency and greater productivity from all Government workers—classified, postal, and wage board—have performed miracles in terms of getting a quality job done, but this has not been enough in the face of new programs and new directions for Federal agencies.

What is an administrator going to do? He's going to have the work done by a private firm, which charges not only for the people it supplies, but which also charges overhead and profit. Government directives say that agencies should not use contracting-out procedures to circumvent personnel ceilings. But given the problems, these directives are going to be honored more in the breach than in the observance.

The record of the Manpower Subcommittee is replete with evidence to sustain this point. In its report issued earlier this year, Representative DAVID N. HENDERSON, subcommittee chairman, said this: "The Federal Government is paying about \$1.4 billion annually more than would be necessary if this work were being handled by civil service employees on the direct payroll of the Federal Government."

The subcommittee went on to say: "It is not good business for the Federal Government to contract with private interests to furnish to the Government 'people' to perform work that currently is and historically has been successfully handled by Government personnel. This, in the opinion of the subcommittee *** is unwarranted (and) is false economy."

The report centered exclusively on the contracting-out procedures of the Defense Department. If its findings were to be applied on a Government-wide basis—and, after all, the contracting out is being conducted in virtually every department and agency of the executive branch—then it is easy to see how the figure on waste would reach, or exceed, our \$2 billion estimate.

The subcommittee criticized the fact that "no one in the Government knows how many man-years are being bought from private industry to work in the Department of Defense nor does anyone know exactly how much it is costing." In other words, not only is the practice widespread, no one has ap-

parently taken the time to discover its wasteful nature—relying on bulletin No. 60-2's "presumption" in favor of the private contractor, irrespective of "disproportionately higher costs." The subcommittee ventured the opinion that the cost of contractor employees "may be as much as 100 percent more than a similar staff of civil service personnel doing a similar job."

The subcommittee said it had found "many examples . . . proving that restrictive civil service personnel ceilings are a major reason for using contractor personnel," and said its members were "shocked at the degree of inefficiency and waste of Government funds" involved.

As to bulletin No. 60-2, the subcommittee said this policy "does lean heavily on the side of commercial sources irrespective of costs." It added: "In consideration of the dynamic nature of our economy, plus the changing concepts of our defense effort, it is rather difficult to imagine a policy of this import not having been revised" since its adoption in 1959.

The record shows only one type of contracting out which has resulted in any appreciable savings—but ironically these savings have been at the expense of another administration principle: Its war on poverty. The subcommittee produced evidence showing that, when janitorial services were turned over to private contractors, the latter often hired workers at substandard wages—often below the minimum wage level. We deplore this type of situation which pits the worker on the lowest rung of the economic ladder against the Government employee—to the detriment of both, and of the country, as well.

Representative HENDERSON, expressing concern over this situation, quoted from testimony by Assistant Secretary of Labor Esther Peterson before the House Education and Labor Committee, when she said: "The Federal Government cannot afford to save money at the expense of those who are among the most unskilled, the weakest, and the poorest of our citizens. This result is directly contrary to one of our most frequently expressed ideals. Contributions to our Federal Treasury from the pockets of those living in the depths of poverty are too costly." We heartily endorse this view. We hope that the officials who head the various Federal agencies will pay heed to Mrs. Peterson.

In recent weeks, there have been signs that the administration is taking a hard, new look at this problem. We particularly applaud the pledges by Norman Paul, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, that thousands of jobs usurped by military personnel will be returned to regular civil service employees, and that other technical jobs now filled by employees of private contractors likewise will be returned to career civil servants. This is a welcome start. Now it must be implemented and enlarged upon throughout Government.

GEC opposition to contracting out is nothing new. Back in 1961 we had this to say on the subject: "This policy has led to . . . the discharge of thousands of career civil service employees before they have become eligible for retirement, and at an age where industry and other governmental agencies are unwilling to employ their services. The policy has caused the waste of valuable skills and loss of the effective utilization of hundreds of millions of dollars invested in plant facilities and tools. It has caused thousands of families and hundreds of local communities to suffer adverse economic adjustment and hardships. It has also fostered and promoted higher defense costs to the taxpayer and has been responsible for the adequacy and quality of our country's defense posture to be vested in the profit-motivated segment of our economy, instead of under the control of the Congress and the administration, as required by our Constitution."

Our commitment to frugality is nothing new, either. Our 31 affiliated unions and their members have long been pledged to the war on waste—pledged to it, in fact, before it was really fashionable. Proof of our commitment has been the wholehearted participation of our members in the Federal employees' incentive award program. Over the past 10 years, hundreds of thousands of their ideas have been accepted by the Government, resulting in savings running to the hundreds of millions of dollars.

Vital as these savings have been, they pale by comparison with the \$2 billion a year which can be saved by the revised personnel procedures which we have recommended to the President.

Bellevue

INCREASED RETIREMENT ANNUITIES FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, H.R. 8469, which provides for retirement annuities increase for our Federal employees, passed the House August 3, 1965.

This bill, with amendments, passed the Senate on September 8, 1965, and on September 9, 1965, the House agreed to the Senate amendments. The bill was then returned to the Senate for signature by the Vice President and forwarding to the White House.

Some of my friends who are vitally interested in this legislation checked and found that it has not yet arrived at the White House. As a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I earnestly urge that this bill be sent to the White House for final approval.

This is important in order that our Federal retirees will be eligible to receive the increased annuities, on December 1, 1965. If the bill is not signed before October 1, the retirees will lose 1 month's benefits as payments will begin after January 1, 1966—instead of December 1, 1965.

THE BRITISH POUND STERLING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on August 12 I made a major speech concerning the state of the British economy and its problems and its relationship to the stability of the international monetary system. In that speech I called attention to the seriousness of the British economic situation—not only the immediate position of the pound sterling, but also to Britain's ability to correct the fundamental weaknesses in its economic system, which contribute to periodic crises in its balance of payments.

Since that speech Secretary Fowler, during his recent European trip, succeeded in putting together a new financial package, with the support of the industrialized countries of Europe plus Canada and Japan, except France. I fully support this action and agree that it will remove the immediate threat of a crisis for the pound sterling and thereby will contribute to the stability of the international monetary system. Note should be taken at the same time of the very drastic steps which the British Government itself has taken in dealing with the threat of inflation in Britain and thereby strengthening the confidence of the world's financial centers in the ability of the British Government to bring

the immediate crisis at hand under control.

My own feeling is, and I have fully expressed this in my August 12 speech, that the real solution to Britain's recurring balance of payments crises is in the modernization of management and labor policies and practices in Britain's industry, as well as strong external financial support for the modernization of key sectors of the British economy, and the making of new trade arrangements between the United States, Britain, and Canada and other countries willing to abide by the terms of these arrangements.

So, while I strongly support the new credit arrangements now concluded between the United States and its industrialized allies to support the pound, I believe that what is needed is for the United States, in cooperation with its allies, to assist Britain to deal with its long-term problems on the basis of long-term arrangements such as I have suggested.

I am glad to note that the Honorable Robert Roosa who, until last year, was Under Secretary of the Treasury, and the architect of many of the ad hoc measures that have been taken to supplement the international monetary structure created in the immediate postwar period, suggested, in his recent book entitled "Monetary Reform for the World Economy," that Britain be extended a long-term loan by the industrialized countries to help pay off Britain's existing relatively short-term debts to the IMF. My own proposal is for the industrialized countries to provide approximately \$10 billion to Britain in long-term loans through the World Bank to provide it with the necessary funds to modernize segments of its economy, in an orderly and considered atmosphere.

I am pleased to report that the reaction to my suggestions was quite favorable in the British press, and once again I urge the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of State to give their careful attention to the proposals contained in my August 12 speech. Anyone who carefully analyzes the British economic situation can see that the principal contributing factors in Britain's current balance-of-payments crisis and the need for Britain to deal with this crisis through drastic, deflationary action are due to long-term fundamental factors that must be corrected so that sterling will continue to play its present major role in the international monetary system. The willingness of industrialized countries, both last November and again a few days ago, to come to the aid of the pound indicates a recognition of the key role of the pound in the existing international monetary system. What must be done now is for the industrialized countries to begin immediate consultations with Britain as to how these countries could contribute to a fundamental correction of Britain's basic economic woes.

I ask unanimous consent that copies of articles appearing in the British press concerning my proposals, as well as recent articles from the American press concerning the state of the pound ster-

September 16, 1965

pursuit of justice, it must now concern itself more than in the past with the welfare of people.

I look forward to the day when the relief of hunger and misery and ignorance—in all parts of the world—will be fixed in legal obligation—as it now is in my own country.

When our world law embodies the right of the despairing to hope, and the responsibility of the fortunate to help, then it will be strengthened a thousandfold in the cause of peace.

If world conditions were largely satisfactory it would not be difficult to evolve a rule of law. But we do not live in a satisfactory world. It is stained with evil and injustice, by ruthless ambition and passionate conflict. Only by fighting these forces we help build a base on which the temple of law may rest.

The second condition of law is institutions. Through them law receives meaning and force. And institutions themselves, through their own actions, help to make new law. The U.N. General Assembly has done this in peacekeeping.

The past 20 years have seen an abundant flowering of new international structures. From the Common Market and NATO, to the IBRD and the Asian Development Bank, order and legal process have been imposed upon spreading segments of the affairs of countries.

Some of these institutions have played a large role in the prosperity of the West and in keeping the peace.

Others contribute to the progress of the developing continents.

The United States has helped build many of these organizations. Their strength represents a victory for the cause you represent—a legal order contributing to the prosperity of each and the peace of all. My country intends to protect and strengthen those institutions, sharing the task with all who share our common purpose.

Central to the hope of world peace through law is the United Nations. Since its beginning, dozens of disputes, many laced with violence, have come before the world assembly. Some have remained unresolved. Many have found a settlement sufficient to allow mankind to move forward in peace. And in some places the United Nations was able to prevent conflict and bloodshed.

I hope we can strengthen the United Nations—not simply as a forum for debate—but as an arena for the solution of disputes.

That is why I have asked a great Justice of our Supreme Court, Arthur Goldberg, to become our Ambassador to the world body. The life of Ambassador Goldberg has been devoted to resolving disputes between those who at first believed that they could not yield one iota from their positions, and who came at last to sign a common agreement.

And my country will fully support the efforts of the Secretary General to bring peace between the great nations of India and Pakistan.

And perhaps in the United Nations—and with the patient effort of individual countries—we can also halt the terrible arms race which threatens to engulf the earth. Perhaps we can succeed through an effective treaty preventing the spread of nuclear weapons—through extending the test ban treaty—by obtaining an agreement halting production of fissionable material for use in nuclear weapons and allocating substantial portions of this material to peaceful uses—by agreeing to reverse the arms race in strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles—and by working toward general and complete disarmament under effective international controls which must be the world's goal.

The third condition of law is acceptance. World law—if it is to bring world order—must reflect the judgment and felt desires of men and nations. What law ignores this—as we have seen in our own history—it itself is ignored.

I think we may be evolving a world con-

sensus on which law can stand. The mass of mankind is slowly realizing the dangers of conflict and the futility of war. They are accepting their responsibility to relieve their own poverty, and the misery of their fellow inhabitants of earth. They are finding—in knowledge and fear and pain—that their common interest lies in common acceptance of their own obligations and the rights of others.

We can see this in a hundred small ways. During the past year the United States was present at 629 international conferences. Since I have been President we have participated in more such conference than during the first 150 years of our history.

Of course, the great issues and the great dangers are not resolved. In the past 12 months there is not a continent that has been spared violence. In the past 2,000 years there has hardly been a decade without war.

If this was all, the future would look dark indeed. But there is another and a brighter thread which runs through the history of the race: It is man's drive to create and to live in harmony with his fellows. This is what we call civilization.

Law is the great civilizing machinery. It liberates the desires to build and subdues the desire to destroy. And if war can tear us apart, law can unite us—out of fear or love or reason or all three.

World peace through world law will not come quickly. We must work, in a variety of ways, to create the vital conditions which may bring us to that day—to build the justice which forms it and the institutions which give it life—and to find the understanding acceptance which will make it work. This means we must be willing to accept small advances and limited goals. But the final objective is the largest and most elusive man has known: peace. Peace which is not simply the absence of conflict or even of fear—but the framework for the fulfillment of human possibility.

How can we dare hope for that which has always escaped mankind? Perhaps it is because our invention draws us together to the point where any war is civil war. Perhaps the vastness of our destructive power makes us shrink from conflict. And perhaps—under the horror and murder of this carnage-filled century—civilization has been slowly flowering—leading us toward victory in the endless battle between man's love for his fellow and his desire to destroy him.

Law is the greater human invention. All the rest give him mastery over his world. Law gives him mastery over himself.

There are those who say the rule of law is a fruitless and utopian dream. It is true that, if it comes, it will come slowly. It will come through the practical and wise resolution of numberless problems. But to deny the possibility is to deny peace itself and that flowering of the spirit which we must believe God meant for man.

I do not deny it.

I believe in it.

And so do you.

If others join us, then the time may yet come when you and your colleagues will be honored as pathfinders toward the final armistice in man's war against himself.

SCENIC DEVELOPMENT AND ROAD BEAUTIFICATION OF THE FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY SYSTEMS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2084) to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal aid highway systems.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield back all time on this side with the exception of one-half minute.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time with the exception of one-half minute to make an inquiry of the distinguished majority leader concerning the program for tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is the intention—and I have discussed this with the distinguished minority leader—to lay before the Senate the immigration bill this evening. No business, of course, will be undertaken on that bill. It will be the pending business tomorrow. It is anticipated that a good part of the day will be taken up in explanations by Senators in favor of and those against the bill. It is also hoped that we shall be able to get some unobjectioned items off the calendar.

On Monday, we shall continue with the immigration bill, if we do not finish it tomorrow. Then on Tuesday, or following the immigration bill, we shall take up the foreign aid appropriation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think I can assure the Senator from Montana now that with the objections that will be made on the immigration bill, it will take all of tomorrow, and that there will be no record vote.

Mr. President, if I may be so bold as to say it, I sincerely hope that our very distinguished majority leader can take a rest over this weekend, and probably a little longer than the weekend. I understand that there are 18 inches of snow at White Fish, Mont.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think he is deeply concerned, as he should be. I hope that he can go home and stay a good many days, because we will carry on with the great efficiency for which we have been noted.

So I wish him well on the journey that he will make, because I know that due to the many demands and obligations of majority leadership in the Senate he has not been able to return as often or stay as long in his State of Montana as he would have liked. That is the penalty of leadership. I know his constituents will look forward to seeing him and that they fully appreciate the leadership duties which keep him in Washington more than he would otherwise choose.

SCENIC DEVELOPMENT AND ROAD BEAUTIFICATION OF THE FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY SYSTEMS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2084) to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal aid highway systems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, and the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from

September 16, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIRKSEN) at the end of the bill was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I offer a substitute for the Dirksen amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the amendment which was agreed to this afternoon would provide that all of the funds be paid out of the General Treasury. The general formula in the bill provides that 75 percent of the funds would be from Federal funds and 25 percent would come from the States.

Letting the amendment stand as it would create a conflict in the bill. I realized that at the time. I have no objection to reconsideration, and the Senator from West Virginia will then offer alternative language which would do what I want to have done and would make it conform to the basic provisions of the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am grateful for the comment of the Senator. I send to the desk my amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the substitute for the Dirksen amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. An amendment to the committee amendment is proposed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] as follows:

Sec. 401. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize private property to be taken or the reasonable and existing use restricted by such taking without just compensation as provided in this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment for the Dirksen amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, would the amendment deal with the proportion of the contribution?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It would change it to 75 percent and 25 percent in accordance with the law.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My amendment would provide for a 100-percent contribution from the Federal Treasury. However, that is in conflict with the other provisions in the bill, which provide for a 75-25-percent contribution.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It would be 75 percent and 25 percent?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment to the Dirksen amendment.

The substitute amendment to the Dirksen amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Dirksen amendment as amended by the substitute offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill, as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I have been in public office some 50 years—in the State legislature, as Governor, and as a Member of the U.S. Senate. I have been dedicated to sound development and expansion of public roads during all of that period, and I hope I have made some contributions to it.

Of course, I am for beautification of highways and increasing their safety; and I have always been for proper and reasonable control of billboards which otherwise may be hazardous. I approve of the more obvious purposes of this bill.

But, I am concerned about the hidden evils and costs of the pending proposal—even with all of the amendments which have been adopted, and all of the promises which have been made.

I do not like the force aspects of the bill—which force States to adhere under penalty of having other highway funds, particularly for our primary system roads, withdrawn for any noncompliance with this Federal act. I did not like it when the penalty was withdrawal of 100 percent of the Federal aid funds. The repugnant force principle still remains under the 10-percent penalty in the bill as amended on the floor.

No one knows how much the bill will cost the Federal Government of the States. The lack of information is so great we adopted a research amendment to try to find out at some future date.

But it is crystal clear that to control and beautify hundreds of thousands of miles in our great primary system of highways—by buying up or cleaning up an eighth of a mile on either side of their existing rights-of-way—is going to cost more taxpayer dollars than anyone has dared to mention in consideration of this bill.

This is money that neither the Federal nor the State governments have for this purpose at this time. They are having difficulty financing construction of the roads themselves—and in this situation this bill would deprive States of road construction money if they do not comply with this bill which would spend State road money for other purposes.

The objectives may be desirable within reason—but I cannot vote for this proposal until more study has been given it and more sound financing has been provided.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the bill, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Billfile
INCREASED ANNUITIES FROM CIVIL SERVICE DISABILITY AND RETIREMENT FUND

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, H.R. 8469, which provides for retirement an-

nualities increase for our Federal employees passed the House on August 3, 1965.

This bill, with amendments, passed the Senate on September 8, 1965. On September 9, 1965, the House agreed to the Senate amendment.

The bill was then returned to the Senate for signature by the Vice President and forwarding to the White House.

Some of my friends who are vitally interested in this legislation have checked and found that it has not as yet arrived at the White House.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I earnestly urge that this bill be sent to the White House for final approval. This is most important in order that our Federal retirees will be eligible to receive the increased annuities on December 1.

If the bill is not signed before October 1, the retirees will lose 1 month's benefits on payments as it will be effective after January 1, 1966, instead of 1965.

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT AT THE WASHINGTON WORLD CONFERENCE ON WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this morning, at the Washington World Conference on World Peace Through Law, the President of the United States delivered a perfectly splendid address on the general subject of peace, disarmament, and the rule of law.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this address may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT AT THE WASHINGTON WORLD CONFERENCE ON WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW, WASHINGTON HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I need not here reaffirm my Nation's continuing dedication to the rule of law. We will work to extend it to the relations between countries. For we believe that is the surest road to a fruitful and secure peace.

Therefore, we who seek a world of law must labor to understand the foundation on which law can rest. We must set to work to build it. For if the rule of law is an idea, the establishment of that rule is the practical work of practical men. We must not let the difficulties of this task lead us into the twin dangers of cynicism or unreasoning faith.

For the fact is that if law cannot yet solve the problems of a tormented earth, it is steadily growing in importance and in necessity.

The first condition of law is justice. That law which oppresses the weak, or denies the fair claims of the poor, will prove a flimsy barrier against the rising storm of man's demand for justice.

Law must not be the prisoner of plunder or privilege.

It is not the soothing keeper of the status quo. It is an instrument in the battle for the hopes of man. And if it is not fashioned as such an instrument—then no matter how beautifully and logically framed—it will yield to violence and terror.

If we, the fortunate of the earth, would ask other people to submit to law, then we ourselves must assume some responsibility for peoples' liberty and peoples' well-being.

International law has been primarily concerned with relations between states. In

22252

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 8, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Florida for the timeliness of his speech and for the condensation and the brevity of his remarks which covered so much in so few words.

Bill file

CERTAIN INCREASES IN ANNUITIES PAYABLE FROM THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8469) to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, and for other purposes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending bill. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, did we ask for the yeas and nays on a motion to recommit made by the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I did not make a motion to recommit. The yeas and nays were ordered on the passage of the bill. However, I am willing to make a motion to recommit.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma is the chairman of the committee. I believe that we should first hear from the distinguished chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered on passage?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, for 5 minutes I will express my wholehearted support of H.R. 8469. I also wish to express my sincere appreciation to the senior Senator from Texas for his leadership in guiding this important legislation through the Retirement Subcommittee and the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Senator YARBOROUGH conducted 2 days of important and very informative public hearings on H.R. 8469. In our discussion of this bill in Committee, his knowledge of the subject matter was an invaluable aid to us all in coming to our decisions.

H.R. 8469 increases the annuities of our retired classified and postal employees. It revises the amendments made in 1962 to the Civil Service Retirement Act so that the administrative process of adjusting annuities according to the cost of living will work more effectively. Time has proven that the 1962 amendments were to a certain extent defective and did not fulfill the aims which Congress hoped for. We believe the change from an annual to a monthly basis for determining the cost-of-living increases

will benefit both the retired employees and the Civil Service Commission which administers the program.

I am in complete agreement with the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the former chairman of the committee during the 83d Congress, that in fact this bill does not change the 3-percent formula for adjusting annuities. It is a case of Tweedledee or Tweedledum. The bill before us only changes the method of determining when these 3-percent adjustments shall be made. Present law requires determination on an annual basis; the bill before us requires a monthly determination. By changing to a monthly basis—a change which the administration approves—a more accurate and equitable system will be achieved.

I add my support to the committee's decision to delay any substantive changes in the Retirement Act until the Congress has an opportunity to study the results of the President's Committee on Federal Staff Retirement Plans. This special panel has held several days of public hearings this year and has heard the views of both employee organizations and experts in the field of retirement programs. There is no doubt that changes will be proposed in the Retirement Act to correct its deficiencies and improve its fiscal soundness. The chairman of the Civil Service Commission, the Honorable John W. Macy, Jr., assured the Retirement Subcommittee of that when he testified before them in August.

The survivor annuity provision of the act, which provided for an increase of 5 percent, was eliminated from the bill. The elimination of this provision affords a saving of approximately \$58 million level cost over the years. In the 55th year, it is estimated that there would be a saving of \$121 million. That provision was cut out of the bill, until we can give the matter further study. We have given this matter very careful attention.

There are several areas where improvements can be made. The survivor annuity provisions of the act for short-term employees are an area of major concern, both to the President's Committee and to the Senate committee. But I agree with the senior Senator from Texas and the decision of the full committee to defer action until the important evidence and conclusions of the President's Committee can be studied by Congress.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to impress upon my colleagues that these are not mere figures with which we deal. "Cost-of-living percentage increases," "base months," "Consumer Price Index statistics"—all of these terms which go into the statutory language of the Civil Service Retirement Act, are by themselves cold and meaningless terms.

We are talking about people, human beings. These are the retired, aged, Federal employees who have worked many years, most of them during times when Federal salaries were far below salaries in private enterprise, and are now living on their retirement annuities and whatever other money, if any, they have.

Even today we are confronted with the problem of making salary adjustments that will afford comparability to Federal employees. Most Federal employees make less than comparable employees in private industry. The increases come late. There is always a time lag before the Federal employee receives a raise. We are talking about people who have to suffer the hard, grinding fact of the inflationary process, which continues to take place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Ninety-seven percent of all surviving annuitants receive less than \$200 a month.

I do not believe this is a time when Congress should find that annuitants who live on less than \$200 a month are receiving a sufficient amount. It is not enough to live on in any decent standard.

H.R. 8469 would be a major progressive step to help these people.

I repeat, we have made this bill conform in large measure to the ideas of the administration. We have eliminated a provision in the bill passed by the House; namely, an increase of survivors' annuity benefits by 5 percent without additional payment on the part of the employee. Our action eliminates a severe drain that would have occurred with respect to the fund.

In regard to the cost-of-living increases, the 3-percent increase takes place over a 3-month period, instead of over a 12-month period. Actually, there is now a 15-month time lapse. This bill eliminates that time lag.

Nobody has noticed that the cost-of-living index has come down enough so that we would have to start worrying about de-escalation in future years. There is no record in our present history indicating that there will be a decrease in the cost of living.

The bill which the distinguished Senator from Texas has brought to the Senate is fair to the employee; it is fair to the retiree; and it is fair to the U.S. Government.

One can talk all he wants about building up the deficit in the civil service retirement fund. I grant Senators that if we killed the intake from the fund as of today, we would have the deficit that has been mentioned, some \$40 billion, representing the acquired unfunded liability for which the fund is committed. Let me assure my colleagues that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will give this problem our most careful consideration next year. I repeat, there is no increase in the cost-of-living payment; there is involved merely a new method of determining when the adjustments shall be made.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall move to recommit the bill, but before making the motion I point out again that the President has appointed a commission to make a study and make recommendations not later than December 1.

September 8, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22251

luncheon where Governor Burns and the Hereditary Spanish Governor of Florida, the 19th descendant of Pedro Menendez, the first Spanish Governor, were guests of honor and principal speakers.

Mr. President, I think it is worthy of note that that worthy descendant of Pedro Menendez still holds the honorary title of Hereditary Adelantado of Florida.

Sunday afternoon I presided at the dedication of the Hispanic Garden and the unveiling there of a statue of Queen Isabella, and later at the dedication of the Spanish building, Casa del Hidalgo, a beautiful structure of native coquina planned by a noted Spanish architect who was present. The speakers were Gen. Alonso Vega and Secretary of the Interior Udall who were followed by Archbishop Hurley who gave the dedicatory blessing.

The actual anniversary of the landing of Pedro Menendez is today, September 8, and the Catholic Church is putting on a highly dignified celebration of the anniversary on this date which will be participated in by many high-ranking members of the clergy and other distinguished citizens from Spain, the Latin American countries and our own Nation. My distinguished colleague, Senator SMATHERS, is participating in that program today. I think it is appropriate to say that the Catholic Church has also spent a large sum in constructing additional edifices at and near the site of the Nombre de Dios Mission, including among others an imposing bridge, a museum and a library. I feel that this date—the 400th anniversary of the first permanent settlement by European people upon the mainland of the United States is an event of such vast importance, calling attention as it does to the great debt which we owe to Spain, particularly in the States of Florida, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California, though not limited to those areas, that it should be the subject of a permanent insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I may add that the various programs at St. Augustine have been largely attended and warmly received. I feel sure that the 400th birthday of St. Augustine will be followed by greater unity in the Western Hemisphere and greater closeness with Spain as well as deeper appreciation of our Spanish heritage in Florida and indeed in much of our Nation and throughout Latin America.

I hope to have later for insertion in the RECORD the dedicatory speech of Ambassador Platteau of Paraguay, the present Chairman of the Organization of American States, at the dedication of the Pan American Building, and the speech of the Spanish Minister of the Interior, Lt. Gen. Alonso Vega dedicating the beautiful Spanish building. Unfortunately, I have not yet received English translations of these two eloquent and noteworthy addresses and I shall therefore ask at a later date that they be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD along with the speech of Secretary Udall. I want at this time, however, to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my own remarks the eloquent

speech of the Secretary-General of the OAS, Dr. Jose A. Mora, which was delivered by him at St. Augustine, upon the occasion of the 400th anniversary of the founding of the city of St. Augustine and the permanent settlement of Florida by Spain.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE SECRETARY GENERAL, ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, DR. JOSE A. MORA, UPON THE OCCASION OF THE 400TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE, SEPTEMBER 4, 1965

The gathering to which we have come in celebration of the 400th anniversary of the founding of the city of St. Augustine has a significance which, to my way of thinking, far exceeds commemoration of a historical event or recollection of the past. I view it rather as opening a way to the future.

Today more than ever there is pressing need for us to go back to our continental beginnings for strength to build solidarity among the peoples of the New World. We have long been engaged in this effort, but we have often failed to recognize our common heritage to the extent that we should, and to draw upon those roots from which has sprung our American family of nations.

President Kennedy, who should ever be an inspiration to us, once said: "Too many Americans think that America was discovered in 1620, when the Pilgrims arrived in my State, forgetting the great adventure of the 16th and 17th centuries in the South and Southwest of the United States."

Indeed, as those present well know, it is here in St. Augustine, where the Spaniards first planted the Christian cross and established the earliest outpost of so-called Western civilization, that the oldest city in the United States is to be found. The name of Pedro Menéndez de Avilés has been inscribed forever on the roll of those whose mighty efforts have built the American nation of today. Other men, other races, other religions, other ideas, other movements have had their share in that great undertaking, but no one can question that the land of Florida has made a singularly fruitful contribution in human terms.

In the last analysis, Julian Ponce de León was not entirely mistaken in his fancyings. It is claimed that he had ambitions of great wealth, and, good Spaniard that he was, he thought the best way of achieving them lay in the discovery of the fountain of youth. Something of the enterprising spirit of the Spanish conquistador seems to be present in the soul of every man in the United States, not to speak of the American woman, who seems truly to have found the secret of eternal youth.

Spain, then, not only located in Florida the fountain of youth, but, better still, managed to establish that concept of the state for all time to come.

This is not all, however. The organizers of these events in celebration of the 400th anniversary of the founding of St. Augustine have kindly chosen to link therewith a tribute to the Organization of American States, which this year is observing its own 75th birthday. The memory of St. Augustine's historic past is thus joined with the present-day ideal of Pan Americanism. This association of ideas fills me with enthusiasm, for it contains a profound truth.

In our present world, the nations of North, Central, and South America have resolved to present a common front against any challenge to the democratic ideals which have taken such firm root in our soil. We cannot agree to our inclusion in a heterogeneous "third world" of neutrals. We seek to be members of a great Atlantic community, the

heirs and propagators of the great liberal tradition of Western civilization.

We do well to hold fast to our ancient past, as represented by St. Augustine and the exploits of those bold adventurers from Spain who, to our everlasting amazement, explored so great a part of the territory of the United States in a scant 50 years after the discovery. United and strengthened in our recollections of those brave deeds, we face the future with increased confidence.

The Organization of American States was founded to aid us in our resolve. In the name of our peoples we have proclaimed the moral and political principles that are to guide us in the work of civilization begun by our ancestors. We are convinced, as the charter of the Organization says, that the historic mission of America is to offer man a land of liberty, and a favorable environment for the development of his personality and the realization of his just ambitions.

Florida bears every mark of being created to serve inter-American communion. It forms a bridge between north and south, a ground provided by geography for meeting, for understanding, and for cultural interchange. Here Spanish mingles with English in a medley which may threaten the purity of both, but which serves admirably for increasing fraternization. The work of good will is splendidly promoted by the spirit of friendly cooperation evidenced both by the authorities and the people of the state. Commercial and social intercourse here encounters the most favorable of environments. The rapidly growing wealth of the state gives impulse to Latin American prosperity in addition to benefiting the United States.

I therefore salute this day the achievement of those men who in government, private industry, labor, the universities, and all sectors of the population have, by their efforts, transformed Florida into one of the splendors of civilization. This peninsula, in which the Spanish conquistadors discovered the germs of future greatness of a country to be, serves the Americans of today as a gateway to the heavens. Here the dreams of science become reality as man embarks upon the conquest of the universe. The cross traced on the sands by the Spanish explorer today is replaced by a cross drawn in the air by jets flashing in horizontal flight from continent to continent and rockets shooting vertically toward the reaches of outer space.

This, to my mind, is what Florida really represents—a new civilization, which offers man all the instruments needed for achieving his own happiness and that of his children, and for winning the battle for a lasting peace that will benefit all people of the earth.

The spirit of the OAS will always be present here, for the interests of the Organization are one with the ideals which have been so firmly implanted in this soil. Not far off our American brothers in other countries are laboring toward the same goals. To them we must lend a helping hand in their struggle for liberty. I am sure that this feeling is shared by the leaders of this State. With their cooperation and that of men throughout the Americas, our presence in Florida will be increasingly fruitful in benefits to mankind.

In our efforts to build a better future, we shall ever be guided by the remembrance of this city of St. Augustine, which forms so rich a portion of our heritage. For we shall recall that here was first implanted the civilization that binds Americans as brothers, and that here were first raised, on behalf of our continent, the prayers that unite man with God.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Delaware and the distinguished Senator from Texas for yielding to me.

September 8, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

We should postpone action here today until we get that report.

The unfunded liability of the retirement fund today is about \$40 billion. Enactment of the bill would add another \$1 billion to this unfunded liability. There is no provision with which to pay the cost of the benefits being authorized.

We cannot escape the fact that if these liberalized provisions are enacted they will have a mathematical effect of further depleting a fund that is already overdrawn. Every retiree will have his retirement computed under the higher formula, plus an increase of 2 percent, plus another increase of 6.5 percent, plus further increases of 3 percent every time there is a rise in the cost of living. All of these increases and no means to pay for them.

The bill would give Government employees, including ourselves, a built-in protection or a hedge against any inflation resulting from our own reckless spending.

There is merit to some parts of this bill, but the very least we can do is postpone action until after receipt of the report and recommendations from the President's Commission.

For that reason I move that the bill be recommitted.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I am willing to yield back my time on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I withhold my time, and yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Texas how this annual amount will be appropriated?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The increase will be paid out of the retirement fund.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If we are to shove the fund deeper and deeper into the red—the statement has been made that the bill would increase withdrawals from the fund by over \$1 billion—we add that much to all the unfunded liabilities.

In view of the fact that within 2 months a Cabinet Committee is to make its report on retirement for the civil establishment, it is the best reason I know of why the bill should go back to committee and why the motion to recommit should be sustained.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I now yield back all time on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit made by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENBERGER] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is detained on official business and if present and voting would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 61, as follows:

[No. 250 Leg.]

YEAS—20

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Pearson
Bennett	Holland	Prouty
Cooper	Hruska	Saltonstall
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Simpson
Dirksen	Kuchel	Tower
Dominick	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Fannin	Murphy	

NAYS—61

Allott	Hayden	Moss
Bass	Hill	Nelson
Bayh	Inouye	Neuberger
Bible	Jackson	Pastore
Boggs	Javits	Pell
Brewster	Jordan, N.C.	Proxmire
Burdick	Long, Mo.	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Long, La.	Ribicoff
Cannon	Magnuson	Scott
Carlson	Mansfield	Smith
Case	McClellan	Sparkman
Clark	McGee	Stennis
Dodd	McIntyre	Symington
Douglas	McNamara	Talmadge
Eastland	Metcalfe	Thurmond
Ervin	Miller	Tydings
Fong	Mondale	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	Monroney	Yarborough
Harris	Montoya	Young, N. Dak.
Hart	Morse	
Hartke	Morton	

NOT VOTING—19

Anderson	Gore	Robertson
Bartlett	Kennedy, Mass.	Russell, S.C.
Byrd, Va.	Kennedy, N.Y.	Russell, Ga.
Church	McCarthy	Smathers
Cotton	McGovern	Young, Ohio
Ellender	Mundt	
Fulbright	Muskie	

So the motion of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware to recommit was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the bill, H.R. 8469, has a very worthy purpose, to extend to retired annuitants formerly in the employ of the U.S. Government increased benefits to meet in some measure the increased cost of living, and I support that objective. But, as has become the practice in the last few years, the bill provides for increased payments but without any funds from which the Federal Government can make the payments over the years.

The trust fund from which payments are made and into which employees have paid their contributions or taxes from their earnings presently amounts to approximately \$17 billion—a very large sum. Unfortunately, the Federal Government has not paid its full share required by law into this fund, and the deficit on an actuarial basis amounts to the staggering sum of over \$40 billion. This means that if these payments are not made by the Federal Government, it will not be able to make the payments that it has promised to its beneficiaries in anticipation of which they have paid into the fund a large percentage of their earnings.

If the pending bill is passed it would, as I have said, provide no funds for the payment of the increased benefits, and the deficit of over \$40 billion would be increased by another billion dollars. But worst of all, as has been the case in recent years, the bill provides a windfall for Members of Congress. Those who are or become entitled to retirement benefits would immediately receive an increase of from 6 to 11 percent. Thereafter the cost-of-living increases in the amount of 3 percent calculated over a consecutive 3-month period would bring an increase but never below the initial percentage increase or any additional cost-of-living upward increases, thus locking in the changes that were included.

I voted for the motion to recommit the bill, for the purpose of having the committee strike from it these windfall benefits and to restrict it to the retirees who actually need the cost-of-living increases. This bill has been labeled as a bill for the retirees who need the increase, and it should be for them. This bill should also make provision for the Federal Government to pay the necessary amount for the increases in payments into the fund, so that the retirees who are to get the benefits will be assured of them.

Since the motion to recommit—a motion that would have brought the bill into accord with its advertised purpose to help those who need the increase—was defeated. I cannot vote for a bill which would provide benefits for some who do not need them now, which would not require the Government to make the additional payments necessary to fund the benefits, and which would increase the deficit to over \$40 billion owed to cover all the benefits.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired.

22254

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 8, 1965

The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. INOUE. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. EYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is detained on official business, and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 10, as follows:

[No. 251 Leg.]
YEAS—73

Aiken	Hill	Neuberger
Allott	Holland	Pastore
Bass	Inouye	Pearson
Bayh	Jackson	Pell
Bible	Javits	Prouty
Boggs	Jordan, N.C.	Proxmire
Brewster	Jordan, Idaho	Randolph
Burdick	Kuchel	Ribicoff
Byrd, W. Va.	Long, Mo.	Russell, S.C.
Cannon	Magnuson	Russell, Ga.
Carlson	Mansfield	Saltonstall
Case	McClellan	Scott
Clerk	McGee	Smith
Dodd	McIntyre	Sparkman
Douglas	McNamara	Stennis
Eastland	Metcalf	Symington
Ellender	Miller	Talmadge
Ervin	Mondale	Thurmond
Fong	Monroney	Tower
Gruening	Montoya	Tydings
Harris	Morse	Williams, N.J.
Hart	Morton	Yarborough
Hartke	Moss	Young, N. Dak.
Hayden	Murphy	
Hickenlooper	Nelson	

NAYS—10

Benne	Dominick	Simpson
Cooper	Fannin	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Hruska	
Dirksen	Lausche	

NOT VOTING—17

Anderson	Gore	Mundt
Bartlett	Kennedy, Mass.	Muskie
Byrd, Va.	Kennedy, N.Y.	Robertson
Church	Long, La.	Smathers
Cotton	McCarthy	Young, Ohio
Fulbright	McGovern	

So the bill (H.R. 8469) was passed.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President—

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 1 minute?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. As the floor manager of the bill which has just passed, I express my appreciation for the skill, the aid and the discussion from the distinguished majority leader and the chairman of the full committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROVE], as well as the aid from the ranking minority member of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], who made a notable contribution, both in the hearings and on the floor of the Senate.

I thank the distinguished members of the opposition for precisely stating their opposition and aiding in the passage of the bill.

I commend the distinguished minority leader and the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware for expediting the work of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the participants in the debate on H.R. 8469, an act to provide certain increases in annuities payable to civil service retirement annuitants. The able senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], assisted by the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROVE], managed this bill in a thorough and efficient fashion. Skillful debate and careful analysis were the tools of other participants in discussion of the bill on both sides of the aisle. I refer specifically to the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] who skillfully discussed the funding problems related to the annuity increases.

In short, it was a discussion of the typically high quality of this body, and I congratulate the Senate on passage of this measure of great significance to retired civil servants and to the country.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT
OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9811) to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural com-

modities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs, and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 20) to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 2305. An act for the relief of Zenaida Quijano Lazaro; and
H.R. 3128. An act for the relief of Angelo Iannuzzi.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 504) to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10536) making supplemental appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FOGARTY, Mr. DENTON, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. MAHON, Mr. LAIRD, Mr. MICHEL, and Mr. BOW were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2853. An act to amend title 17, United States Code, with relation to the fees to be charged;

H.R. 7888. An act providing for the extension of patent numbered D-119,187;

H.R. 8917. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Omaha Tribe of Nebraska, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9545. An act providing for the acquisition and preservation by the United States of certain items of evidence pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy;

H.R. 9778. An act to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to codify recent military law, and to improve the Code;

H.R. 9867. An act to provide penalties for the use of the interstate route marker for commercial purposes;

H.R. 9877. An act to amend the act of January 30, 1913, as amended, to remove certain restrictions on the American Hospital of Paris;

H.R. 10206. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended;

H.R. 10234. An act to amend section 1085 of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the reimbursement procedure required

22240

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 8, 1965

Mediation and Conciliation Service, for his mediation work with the parties during the many days of negotiation conferences with them. Governor Collins and I found that the negotiators for both the union and the steel industry had great respect for and confidence in Bill Simkin. The factual material that he had gathered over the weeks and the mediation service which he and his able staff had rendered to the parties helped to provide the seeds for the sowing of commonsense suggestions in the minds of the industry and union negotiators by the President and by Secretary Wirtz and Secretary Connor.

One other official deserves special mention by me and that is Mr. Joseph Califano of the President's staff. While Governor Collins and I were in Pittsburgh, Mr. Califano stayed on the Washington, D.C., end of the long-distance telephone much of the time day and night, advising with us on our findings as we developed them as a result of our conferences with the parties to the dispute. He in turn relayed them to the President and relayed back to us further instructions and advice which we sought from the President. Mr. Califano was of great help to all of us and particularly to the President throughout the handling of the steel case by the White House. Now I want to say a few words about the negotiations here in Washington, under the leadership and statesmanship of the President of the United States.

The President agreed with the recommendation that Governor Collins and I made to the group that had breakfast with him on August 30, that it was important for the parties to the dispute to hear from the President himself as to how serious the consequences of a steel industry shutdown would be to the security and economy of the Nation.

As I said in this Chamber last Thursday I do not advise Presidential interventions in labor disputes as a general rule. I believe they should be very rare. The President of the United States should not have imposed upon him such a burden. He is entitled to have labor and industry settle their differences without White House intervention through their voluntary exercise of a precious freedom, namely, free collective bargaining.

When the Federal Government does intervene, it should in most instances be kept at the Department of Labor and Department of Commerce level. There are instances, however, in which the President himself would fail the American people if he did not personally intervene, if he thought the public interest warranted intervention. This steel industry dispute was one of such cases. In my many years of service in this field, there have been only a half dozen cases in which one could say with assurance that a White House intervention was justified. But this was one such case, because there would have resulted both a strike and a lockout. Do not forget that when the parties to a labor dispute come to a point where they really break off negotiations between themselves, the employer has to assume equal respon-

sibility with the union for the cessation of operations of that industry.

I stated before I left Pittsburgh, I stated at the White House breakfast the other morning, and I was heard to state on two occasions on the floor of the Senate last week, that in my judgment there was equality of responsibility resting upon the steel companies and the steel union with respect to this dispute. The facts involved in the case simply did not justify either the union or the Steel Companies throwing our country into the economic losses that would result from a breakdown in collective bargaining between them.

There is no question about the President's laying the facts before the parties when he asked them to come to Washington to meet with him at the White House in the presence of his Secretary of Labor and Secretary of Commerce. Such a conference between the President and the parties to the dispute was a procedural recommendation that Governor Collins and I had made to him at the breakfast meeting on August 30.

The President laid it on the line, so to speak, and he demonstrated to the parties his complete knowledge in detail of what was involved in the dispute. He showed complete knowledge of the union problems and the steel companies' problems. The President knows the problems that confront the industry with regard to foreign importation, the question of the stockpiling of the inventories that have taken place, and the facts about the healthy profits within the industry. He knows the facts about historic inequities that have grown up within the job classifications within the labor force. This involves inequities between incentive and nonincentive pay rates. He assigned to Secretary Wirtz and Secretary Connor the great task of taking the parties to the Executive Building across the street from the White House and starting under Presidential instructions the series of negotiation sessions which are now well known to the American people, because of the adequate news coverage that these conferences received.

I stress the fact that the President kept in touch with these negotiations until their final successful culmination.

I have already read some articles in the newspapers which would indicate that there are those who feel that the final settlement somehow has violated some economic guidelines that are supposed to be followed in the settlement of labor disputes in order to avoid the possibility of inflation.

Those guidelines are relative, in that it has always been recognized that so-called historic inequities within an industry must be adjusted in connection with any guidelines and that in doing equity and justice it is necessary to adjust those inequities, over and above any guidelines.

There is nothing new about economic guidelines in settling the economic issues involved in a major labor dispute. During the war we had them in connection with the operation of the War Labor Board. We followed them subject only to fair adjustments necessary to eliminate inequities and injustices.

Therefore, when we had a case in which the facts showed that existing inequities had developed within an industry, those inequities were adjusted over and above the guidelines.

That is exactly what has happened since the so-called 3.2 guideline was recommended for handling economic issues in labor disputes starting with the Kennedy administration. The result is that no one can point to any settlement in a major labor dispute within the past few years in which the dispute has been settled within the 3.2 guideline as far as so-called inequities are concerned. However, the 3.2 guideline is of great importance in directing the settlement of a dispute, because that means that the major wage settlement should conform to the guideline. That is what has happened in case after case. It happened in the steel settlement of last week. It happened in the 1962 East Coast Longshore case and the 1964 East Coast Longshore case in which I was involved.

Inequities were adjusted, but the basic wage settlements did not violate the guidelines. One of the things that must always be given great weight in the settlement of a major dispute is the relationship of that dispute to settlements in comparable industries.

We cannot select a given industry—for example, the steel industry—and settle a labor dispute independently of the terms of settlement of disputes in comparable industries.

That was a problem that confronted the President and confronted the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce in this steel case. That was a problem that Governor Collins and I placed major stress on in our report to the President and to the Secretaries.

Let it be said at this time that in the automobile industry, in which a major settlement was reached some months ago, it was necessary to reach a settlement somewhat above the guideline so far as the so-called fringe benefits and wage inequities were concerned. But in the automobile dispute as well as other major disputes the settlement was not above the guidelines so far as the basic wage changes were concerned. Those cases stayed within the guideline. That is also true of the steel case.

Let us not forget that in the automobile industry, the union had the benefit of a so-called cost-of-living escalation clause. That does not exist in the steel industry contract. This was a major problem that confronted Secretary Wirtz and Secretary Connor, as well as the President of the United States in the steel case.

Therefore, although the basic wage increase in the automobile industry was finally negotiated at a figure higher than the basic wage increase settlement in the steel case, it should be noted that the union in the steel case does not receive any benefit from a cost-of-living escalation clause. However, Walter Reuther, since the settlement in the automobile case, has received an additional 8 cents an hour over and above the settlement in that case because of the cost-of-living escalation clause.

In the negotiations within the steel industry 2 years ago, the cost-of-living-

September 8, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22239

cost of keeping the peace in the Middle East and the Congo or be deprived of their voting rights in the General Assembly. Mr. Goldberg declared that the U.S. position was "constitutionally, legally, procedurally, and administratively correct." He acknowledged, however, that the majority of the General Assembly is not prepared to apply article 19 and that the consensus was that the Assembly should proceed normally. (For more than a year all votes on substantive matters have been avoided.) And, in the spirit of his predecessor, the late Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, Mr. Goldberg declared: "It is time for the General Assembly to get on with its heavy agenda, which is indeed the unfinished business of mankind."

"We must find new strength," he said, "and new capacities for building, brick by brick, the community of men."

The lofty words did not hide the fact that this country had made a major retreat. Goldberg placed "responsibility where it properly belongs" (on the delinquents) and he made it clear that the United States would not allow a double standard to exist in paying United Nations costs in the future. He even reserved the right for the United States to refuse to pay if it had strong reasons for doing so.

POWERS CANNOT BE COERCED

Actually, however, Washington has painfully concluded it was wrong in the first place to stretch article 19 of the charter to pressure other powers into paying the extraordinary expenses of which they disapproved. At this stage of the evolution of the U.N. the world powers cannot be coerced. The organization must operate by consent—and this means by compromise. This admits a weakness, but the weakness has been apparent a long time.

The Soviet Union, France and 11 other nations in arrears on the peacekeeping assessments have in effect held that such activity is a function of the Security Council (where all five permanent members have a veto), not the General Assembly. The rationale extended, however, to financing peacekeeping approved by the Council, in effect holding that such payments must be voluntary. Meantime, Britain, Canada and the Scandinavian countries have shown the way of donating almost \$18 million. If sufficient other payments are forthcoming voluntarily, the \$108 million deficit will be wiped out. In any respect, operations in Cyprus and other troubled spots have been financed with voluntary payments.

The biggest challenge to the United Nations—Vietnam—is still ahead. The Johnson administration has wisely given priority to the future of the U.N. over a row about past liabilities.

Mr. Goldberg discharged with dignity an onerous but necessary assignment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CERTAIN INCREASES IN ANNUITIES PAYABLE FROM THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfin-

ished business, H.R. 8469, be laid aside temporarily, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 635, H.R. 8469.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8469) to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 8469) to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with amendments on page 5, after line 9, to strike out:

Sec. 2. Section 10 of the Civil Service Retirement Act as amended (5 U.S.C. 2260), is amended by striking out "55" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "60". This amendment shall not apply with respect to employees or Members retired or otherwise separated prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

And, at the beginning of line 16, to change the section number from "3" to "2".

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware obtained the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from Oregon.

STEEL DISPUTE SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make certain comments in connection with the roles played in the settlement of the steel dispute last week by the President of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Connor, and the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz.

In my more than 35 years of experience in being involved in negotiations of major labor disputes in this country, I have never seen such a magnificent and masterful job of industrial statesmanship as that performed by the President of the United States in the settlement of the steel case.

Some of us in the Senate may say what the President would not be in a position to say. I believe this case will be a subject of study for many years to come, in labor relations courses, in writings on mediation, conciliation, and arbitration and by students and authorities of industrial relations. I hope to be of some help to students who may study the case, by my comments today.

Although the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Connor, and the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz, performed negotiating services—as I have told them in a letter that I sent to each of them—that likewise have not been excelled, nevertheless, when all is said and done, the country would be in the throes of a shutdown of the major industry in the United States at this very hour, were it not for the industrial statesmanship of the President of the United States. I have never seen its equal. I state, in anticipation, to any

critics who might seek to give the impression that the President used persuasion not related to the facts of the case, that they could not be more wrong.

The President of the United States discussed the details of this controversy, before he intervened, at a breakfast held in the White House the morning of August 30, at which the substantive issues were outlined for him in detail—issues which had resulted in a complete deadlock between the steel companies and the steel workers' union.

On August 28, the President had sent to Pittsburgh the Under Secretary of Commerce, the former Governor of Florida, Mr. Leroy Collins, and the senior Senator from Oregon to participate in a fact-finding mission. Some Senators may not be aware that Governor Collins and the senior Senator from Oregon were not authorized to make any suggestions to the representatives of the union and of the steel companies for a settlement of the dispute.

We spent hours with the parties to find out what their differences were, and to determine for the President whether they had actually reached a good-faith deadlock in their negotiations.

The President instructed us to find out if there was any hope of further free collective bargaining between the disputants or if it appeared that Government intervention were necessary in order to avoid the unreparable damage to the Nation which would result from a shutdown of the steel industry.

When we reported to the President on the morning of August 30, Governor Collins and I were in complete agreement on every detail of all the minutiae of the findings we brought back from Pittsburgh. We reported to the President that in our opinion, if the parties were left to themselves there would be a steel industry shut down at midnight on Tuesday, August 31, 1965.

We tried to be of service to the President in outlining at great length and in detail the White House procedure we thought should be followed. Essentially, it called for continued negotiations, under the direction of the White House. We made recommendations, within flexible brackets, for terms of settlement of the dispute, should the Government finally be in a position where it would have to suggest a settlement. But that was the sum and substance of the contribution that Governor Collins and I made; and that is a minor contribution, compared with the great work of the President and the negotiating efforts of the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce which followed that breakfast meeting on August 30.

I shall always be a richer man, from the standpoint of a valuable experience, because I had the opportunity of serving with Leroy Collins, of Florida, on this mission. In my judgment, he is a great American. One cannot pay a higher compliment to a man and to a friend than to say he is a great American. Leroy Collins is a dedicated American, and I learned much from him during our work together in Pittsburgh.

Also I wish to pay tribute to Mr. William Simkin, Director of the Federal

October 15, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

26107

at any time consultation is requested by other responsible agencies.

FINANCIAL INFORMATION

The acquisition cost of the materials that would be disposed of under the authority of this bill was \$64,865,700. The best estimate of the current market value of these materials is \$82,500,000. The disposal of these materials will be accomplished over a period of several years and hence it is impossible to know what the market will be throughout the disposal period.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 1582) to remove a restriction on certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of California, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 8126) to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law, provide broader coverage, improved standards of minimum wage and overtime compensation protection, and improved means of enforcement, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

NORTH COUNTIES HYDRO-ELECTRIC CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 10097) for the relief of North Counties Hydro-Electric Co. which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the word "for", to strike out "past and future".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 865), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to pay the North Counties Hydro-Electric Co. of Illinois \$187,058 as the amount found by the Court of Claims in full satisfaction of its claims against the United States for damages and losses suffered as the result of the construction of a dam on the Illinois River at Starved Rock near Ottawa, Ill., in accordance with the opinion of the Court of Claims in congressional case No. 2-59, decided on April 16, 1965.

CONSENT TO ENTRY OF CONNECTICUT, RHODE ISLAND, AND VERMONT INTO BUS TAXATION PRORATION COMPACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 10369) to give the consent of Congress to the States of Connecticut,

Rhode Island, and Vermont, to enter into a compact providing for bus taxation proration and reciprocity which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to enter into a compact providing for bus taxation proration and reciprocity substantially in the form of the compact set forth in title II, section 201, of Public Law 89-11, approved April 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 60)." and insert "That the consent of Congress is given to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to become parties to title II of the Compact on Taxation of Motor Fuels Consumed by Interstate Buses and to the Agreement relating to Bus Taxation Proration and Reciprocity as consented to by the Congress in the Act of April 14, 1965 (79 Stat. 60)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to give the consent of Congress to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to become parties to title II of the Compact on Taxation of Motor Fuels Consumed by Interstate Buses and the Agreement relating to Bus Taxation Proration and Reciprocity."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 866), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as amended, is to grant the consent to Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to join in title II of that certain compact on taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity.

STATEMENT

The information contained in the House report on H.R. 10369 relates the justification for this legislation in the following manner:

"By title II, section 201, of Public Law 89-11, approved April 14, 1965, Congress gave its consent to the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and New York, to enter into a certain compact providing for bus taxation proration and reciprocity, and by section 203 Congress directed the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into it.

"Under this compact, parties agree to prorate bus registration fees so that any owner of a fleet of buses may register the buses of that fleet in any compacting State by paying to that State total registration fees in an amount equal to that obtained by applying the proportion of in-State fleet miles divided by total fleet miles, to the total fees that would otherwise be required for regular registration of all the vehicles in the compacting State.

"Public Law 89-11 requires the prior consent of Congress to the entry of additional States into the compact.

"As appears from the attached copies of State legislative enactments identically adopting the compact in question, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont have taken the necessary State action to join in the same. The committee knows no reason why these States should not participate in the compact. H.R. 10369 contains the usual reservation of congressional power to alter, amend, or repeal the consent granted."

The committee, in its original consideration of the bill which resulted in Public Law 89-11, was aware of the merits of that compact. It appears that the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont have found that the tax proration and reciprocity features of title II of that compact are to their advantage and have passed enabling legislation to allow each of the States to become a party to the compact. Those legislative enactments of the States involved are attached hereto and made a part hereof.

The committee is in agreement with the legislation, as amended, and recommends it to the favorable consideration of the Senate.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 9495) to increase the appropriation authorization for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Commemorative Coin Act, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

MEMORIAL TO THE LATE DR. ROBERT H. GODDARD, THE FATHER OF ROCKETRY

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 597) for the erection of a memorial to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of rocketry was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report—No. 868—explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF THE JOINT RESOLUTION

House Joint Resolution 597 would direct the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to erect in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts an appropriate memorial to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, former professor of physics at Clark University in Worcester, Mass., and the father of rocketry. The memorial would be in the form of a sculpture in bronze or other enduring metal and would symbolize the scientist's role as the pioneer of the space age. It would be located on the Clark University campus in Worcester, Mass., on the site donated by the Clark trustees adjacent to the Robert Hutchings Goddard Library. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration would request the advice and comment of the Commission of Fine Arts and consult with Clark University trustees with respect to the design and setting of the memorial. The memorial would give appropriate recognition to the pioneering efforts of the late Dr. Goddard in his country's achievements in rocketry and supersonic flight. There would be authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, not to exceed \$150,000 to carry out the purposes of the joint resolution.

HOUSE ACTION

The Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives held a hearing on House Joint Resolution 597 on September 7, 1965, at which it heard testimony and received statements from a number of Members of Congress, Federal agency spokesmen, and private-institution representatives. The committee reported the measure favorably with an amendment limiting the appropriation authorization for the memorial to \$150,000. The joint resolution as amended was passed by the House of Representatives on September 20, 1965.

A pertinent excerpt from the report of the Committee on Science and Astronautics to accompany House Joint Resolution 597 (H. Rept. 961, 89th Cong.) is as follows:

Dr. Robert H. Goddard, who is to be honored by the memorial, is the father of modern rocket propulsion. Born on October 5, 1882, he was a physicist of great insight who also had a unique genius for invention. Although his speculations and experiments were often ridiculed and his genius largely unappreciated in his own day, the flight of Goddard's first liquid-fuel rocket in 1926 is now generally considered to be a feat as epochal in history as that of the Wright brothers at Kitty Hawk. Eighteen years after his first successful demonstration, many of his basic concepts and technical designs came to worldwide notice in the German V-2 ballistic missiles. The advent of intercontinental missiles, earth satellites, and spacecraft was not only based upon that to which Robert H. Goddard devoted his creative talents but also open up a new era in the accelerating impact of science and technology upon the affairs of mankind. The greater part of Dr. Goddard's life was devoted to his work on rockets and rocket apparatus; and although the labor of this scholarly, modest man was appreciated by experts, it went largely unrecognized until the recent dawn of what is now called the space age.

The joint resolution further provides that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall request the advice and comment of the Commission of Fine Arts (an independent agency of the Federal Government) and shall consult with Clark University trustees with respect to the design and setting of the memorial.

It has been claimed that numerous honors have already been paid to the late Dr. Goddard for his achievements. These include the naming of a major installation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the issuance of a memorial postage stamp, the designation by the President of March 16, 1965, as "Goddard Day," and other similar tributes. However, it should be noted that these tributes are either temporary or operational in nature and that there does not exist today any permanent national memorial in the nature of a work of art in commemoration of this distinguished individual.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to express my great satisfaction that the Senate has passed House Joint Resolution 597. This joint resolution authorizes the erection of a memorial to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of rocketry. Because of Dr. Goddard's close association with that university, I feel it is particularly appropriate that the memorial will be located on the Clark University campus.

Although scorned by many of his countrymen, Dr. Goddard nonetheless pursued his pioneering research on rocket flight. In 1926, he became the first man to launch a liquid fuel rocket. Because of his foresight, brilliance, and conviction, Dr. Goddard made discoveries for which our current missile

technology is still indebted. It is most fitting that our country honor this outstanding man.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT OF COMPILATION ENTITLED "LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS AND ESTABLISHING REVOLVING FUNDS"

The resolution (S. Res. 151) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the compilation entitled "Legislation Authorizing Appropriations and Establishing Revolving Funds" was considered and agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1169), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 151 would authorize the printing as a Senate document of the committee print entitled "Legislation Authorizing Appropriations and Establishing Revolving Funds (as of March 1965)," compiled by the Bureau of the Budget at the request of the Committee on Government Operations, from information furnished by various departments and agencies, and further would authorize the printing of 5,000 additional copies of such documents for the use of that committee.

The printing cost estimate, supplied by the Public Printer, is as follows:

Printing cost estimate	
To print as a document (1,500 copies).....	\$653.00
5,000 additional copies, at \$146 per thousand.....	730.00
Total estimated cost, S. Res. 151.....	1,383.00

STUDY OF CRIMINAL LAWS AND PROCEDURES

Resolution (S. Res. 152) to study criminal laws and procedures was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of criminal laws and procedures.

Sec 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from October 1, 1965, to January 31, 1966, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; Provided, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,100 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the

Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1966.

Sec. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$30,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 870—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 152 would authorize through January 31, 1966, the expenditure of not to exceed \$30,000 by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting through its Special Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of criminal laws and procedures. The special subcommittee would study certain anticrime bills, including one dealing with the so-called *hollory* rule, which are presently pending before the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar for the moment, except for one bill which the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service wishes to have called up at this time.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 844 (H.R. 11303).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11303) to amend section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act as amended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MONROEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all after the enacting clause be stricken, and that there be substituted therefor the language of Calendar No. 775, S. 2572.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and the amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2268), is further amended by adding the following new subsection (f):

"(f) Each annuity payable from the Civil Service retirement and disability fund (other than the immediate annuity of an annuitant's survivor or of a child entitled under section 10(d)) which has a commencing date after December 1, 1965, but not later than December 31, 1965, shall be increased from its commencing date as if the annuity commencing date were December 1, 1965."

Sec. 2. The provisions under the heading "CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND" in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959 (72 Stat. 1064; Pub-

October 15, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

26109

the Law 85-844), shall not apply with respect to benefits resulting from the enactment of the Act.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, S. 257, would amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to extend the benefits of the recent retirement annuity increase by Public Law 89-205, to those Federal employees whose annuities commence after December 1, 1965, but not later than December 31, 1965.

The primary purpose of this bill is to maintain the services of many experienced and efficient postal employees who otherwise will retire before the very heavy mail volume period at Christmas time. Under the provisions of the recent retirement act, any Federal employee who retires on an immediate annuity before December 1, will receive the annuity increases. Those who retire after December 1, will not receive any benefit under the bill. A great many Federal employees plan to retire before the bill becomes effective. In the postal service, it is estimated that normal retirement figures will multiply three or fourfold. The Department believes that as many as 20,000 employees will retire before the effective date of the bill so that they can receive its benefits. Unfortunately, those contemplating retirement are the most experienced employees. Veteran letter carriers, supervisors, foremen, postmasters, postal service officers, and even regional directors with 30 or more years of service who are now eligible for immediate retirement plan to retire before December. If 20,000 experienced and capable postal employees retire before December, they will necessarily be replaced by junior employees—in some cases brand new employees—who do not yet possess adequate skill and knowledge of their postal duties. The public, which relies on efficient Christmas-time delivery, will suffer.

To avoid this problem, the Post Office Department has requested that the benefits enacted in Public Law 89-205 be extended so that any Federal employee who retires prior to December 31, 1965, will be considered, for retirement purposes, to have retired prior to December 1, 1965. Those already on the retirement rolls will receive their annuity increases on time. Those who wish, for whatever reason, to retire before December, may do so. But those who wish to stay on can do so without losing the benefits of the retirement increase which Congress has passed. The postal service and other Government agencies will retain the benefit of the service during the Christmas season and the American people will have the benefit of their greater postal skills during the Christmas period.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has not been able to estimate accurately the cost of this amendment, but it is more than probable that any cost resulting from enactment of S. 2572 will be more than made up by the utilization of experienced personnel in key positions in the postal field service during the Christmas season, as well as in other Federal agencies.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator

from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is very much interested in this matter, has cleared it?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct. We are taking up the House-passed bill. I believe that I misspoke myself in this regard, that the Senate language be substituted. The bills are identical.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill (S. 2572) will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 790), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill will extend the benefits of the recently enacted increases in civil service retirement annuities to any person whose annuity commences not later than December 31, 1965.

JUSTIFICATION

H.R. 8469, the 1965 annuity increase bill, established its effective date as the first day of the third month following enactment. In order to provide increases for all annuitants presently on the rolls before Christmas, President Johnson signed the bill on September 28, 1965. The effective date of the bill is therefore December 1, 1965. Any annuity presently being paid, or any annuity which commences not later than December 1, 1965, shall be increased by 1.5 percent plus the amount of increase in the Consumer Price Index from the end of the year 1962 until the date of enactment. The latest report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows an increase of 4.6 percent since 1962, thus producing a 6.1 percent increase payable from the retirement fund. In addition, Public Law 87-793, the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, provided a 2-percent increase for all annuities commencing in 1965. Thus the employee who retires prior to December 1, 1965, is entitled to an 8.1 percent increase in his retirement annuity. The employee retiring after December 1 will receive only the 2-percent increase enacted in 1962.

Evidence indicates that many Federal employees are considering retirement before December in order to receive the benefits of the annuity increase. In the Post Office Department, it is estimated that as many as 20,000 employees will retire early. Unfortunately, the timing of the annuity increase is not advantageous. The postal service experiences its greatest activity during the month of December. The American public relies heavily on the efficient and speedy delivery of Christmas cards, letters, and packages. If 20,000 employees retire prior to the Christmas season, they will necessarily be replaced by less experienced or completely unexperienced employees. Positions of substantial responsibility, including postal supervisors, experi-

enced or completely unexperienced employees. Positions of substantial responsibility, including postal supervisors, experienced clerks and carriers, postmasters, regional officers, and even some regional directors, will be replaced by other employees who are not familiar with the duties and responsibilities of the new position. The postal service and hence the American people will suffer any delays in mail service which result from this significant changeover in manpower.

To avoid this problem, the committee, upon recommendation of the Post Office Department and with the approval of administration officials, has given favorable consideration to legislation authorizing the extension of the effective date of the annuity increase to December 31, 1965. In this way any postal or other Federal employee who chooses to remain on duty during the busy Christmas season may do so without losing the benefits of the retirement annuity increase. The present bill does not require any employee to remain in service; it merely encourages such employees to remain at their posts until the Christmas season is over.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

VISIT OF MAARTEN BOLLE, NETHERLANDS NEWSMAN, TO MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, recently, Montana played host to one of the best known and ablest foreign newsmen in Washington, Maarten C. Bolle, of the Netherlands.

Maarten Bolle is an old friend to many of us in the Senate. In September, he and his wife visited Yellowstone National Park and nearby Montana.

The Bolles were given a sampling of the gregarious and good-natured Montanans. They also discovered a "bit of Holland" in several small communities near Bozeman where the first Dutch migrants settled 71 years ago.

Their visit to Montana was a success in part because of Fred J. Martin, publisher of the Park County News in Livingston. Fred published a most interesting feature story on the visit of Mr. and Mrs. Bolle, and I am looking forward to Maarten Bolle's journalistic observations after his visit to the Treasure State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article which was published in the September 16 issue of the Park County News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTSTANDING FOREIGN CORRESPONDENT TO UNITED STATES, MAARTEN BOLLE, NETHERLANDS, LOCAL VISITOR, TELEPHONES BROADCAST ABOUT YELLOWSTONE PARK

Do we Americans have a duty to be informed as to what's going on in this world?

Are we spinning our wheels on inconsequential problems, instead of realizing the implications?

Should we substitute a false security for faith? Weaken our pride by doubletalk? Condone immorality and dishonesty? Are we inclined to reach to government aid from every level—local, State, and Federal—and at the same time preach against it?

Despite the dangers and causes of major concern that the above questions contain, there's plenty of room for optimism. Let's hope that you readers, particularly the civics class at the Lincoln Junior High in Livingston, can get from this just a wee bit of the mental stimulation that came our way as a result of a chance to visit Friday and Saturday with one of the world's most famous journalists, Maarten C. Bolle, and his wife from Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

To give an idea of the speed of communications these days, Mr. and Mrs. Bolle were visiting with Superintendent John S. McLaughlin of Yellowstone National Park Friday afternoon and gave him a surprise by telling him that a telephoned radio report from Yellowstone to Amsterdam, via New York, about the wonders of Yellowstone already had been heard that day by more than 3 million people in the Netherlands and perhaps a like number in Belgium.

Guides on their trip through Yellowstone included Jim Godbolt, administrative assistant to the superintendent, and George D. Marler, NPS geologist and one of the world's recognized authorities on geysers.

Mr. Bolle, who has been in Washington for more than 10 years and is one of the deans of foreign newspapermen assigned to Washington, recently won the University of California top award for foreign correspondents to the United States. The award is the equivalent of the Pulitzer prizes to American newspapermen, one of which was won this year by Mel Ruder, editor-publisher of the *Hungry Horse News*, Columbia Falls, for his reporting of the northwest Montana flood in 1964.

The Bolles were induced to include Yellowstone Park and Montana in their vacation schedule at the urging of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD and our chance to visit them resulted from a telephone call from Peggy DeMichele, the Senator's administrative assistant, saying they would like to meet Montanans of all shades of political conviction. Mayor Willard Fraser, of Billings, and the writer drove them to Livingston from Mammoth Friday afternoon.

Fortunately, the Montana Municipal League convention in Livingston was timely thanks to Mayor George Ommundsen and Al Klinger, league secretary. The Bolles had the opportunity to meet and hear Gov. Tim Babcock, as well as to visit with and meet most of the visiting mayors, aldermen, and city officers at the convention on Friday evening during the social hour and banquet and on Saturday morning at the mayors' prayer breakfast. They also had the opportunity to visit briefly with Con Douma and members of his family, who are native Americans but of Dutch descent.

Maarten Bolle, as a result of his newspaper career, is a keen observer, knows how to probe for information, has great respect for another's convictions, is a keen student of current history, devours a newspaper, and seemingly never tires.

But, both he and his wife were surprised delightfully to discover a genuine American "bit of Holland" in the Churchill and Amsterdam communities northwest of Bozeman and south of Manhattan. First migrants from the Netherlands came 71 years ago in 1894, and today the Christian Reformed churches have a membership of 480 families. In the schools, also operated by the church, there are 150 in the high school and 300 in the elementary school at Amsterdam.

Thanks to the suggestion of Mayor Harry Morrow of Bozeman, Harry Droge, a prominent member of the Netherlands' community and an outstanding Montanan, Saturday morning took the visitors on a quick tour of the "Dutch Valley." Droge, who served as chairman of the Gallatin County Board of Commissioners for many years and in many other capacities, came to Gallatin County more than 60 years ago and subsequently was followed by his parents, six brothers and his sister. He and his wife, a member of another oldtime family that had emigrated from Holland, have six daughters and a son, who with their families all reside in the area and operate dairy farms. The daughters and the son also married spouses of Dutch descent.

The Hollanders are proud of their farms, their homes, their irrigation systems, their dairy and beef cattle, hogs and other livestock. Collectively, they testify to their faith by the four churches they support, two at Churchill, one at Bozeman, and one at Gallatin Gateway, and to their concern for education by the modern high school and elementary school, privately supported, at Churchill.

But, as Harry Droge reiterated again and again, the Hollanders are proud of their heritage, but equally as proud of their American citizenship. They, he declared, are grateful for the opportunities which they found in the United States and in Montana and want to protect that heritage for the next and future generations. Like other Americans, they grumble about taxes and trends, but they meet their obligations.

In Montana "The Big Sky Country," there's lots of room—only 4.1 persons for each of 147,138 square miles (4.6 in Park County's 2,631 and 8.7 in Gallatin's 2,540 square miles). In contrast, the Netherlands has 760 persons in each one of the 15,800 square miles, of which 40 percent is given to pasture, 30 percent to farming, 7 percent to forests and 3 percent to horticulture. Of the land 90 percent is in holdings of fewer than 50 acres and more than 50 percent of fewer than 10 acres (World Almanac).

When we stop to think of how Netherlands, Belgians, Danes, Swedes, Norwegians and Swiss have maintained their faith, pride and integrity, although threatened, invaded and practically left in fatters and with their property confiscated or destroyed, cannot we take a lesson from them? These people, together with the English, Irish, French, German, Spanish, Italian, Greek, and other God-fearing peoples surely are our best hope for enduring friendships and fair treatment.

Yet, we best recognize that "If 1,000 were in the world" (taken from *Our Church Times*), of this number 560 are living in Asia (and the ratio is increasing day by day), 91 in Africa, 70 in the U.S.S.R. and 50 in South America.

Maarten Bolle has promised to write a column for the *Park County News* on his impressions of Montana. Likewise, he's promised to send us a translation of his column on President Lyndon B. Johnson, shortly after he took office following the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. This column was one which the judges who studied the writings of more than 238 foreign correspondents in the United States considered was one of the most outstanding journalism stories they had read and it was one of the reasons for Bolle's selection for the award as the outstanding foreign correspondent covering the United States. Bolle's quest for news frequently takes him to Canada, Mexico, Central America and to South America. He served in London prior to his Washington assignment.

He plans to visit in Salt Lake City, Barstow, Calif., Los Angeles, El Paso, Houston, New Orleans and other cities on the current trip. Stories will include a visit to a Texas

cattle ranch, an oil well being drilled off the coast of Louisiana—he doesn't believe in sitting at his desk in Washington and depending on the wire service for his news.

Bolle majored in English in college. He speaks English fluently, as well as French, German, and several other languages. He has great respect for Senator MIKE MANSFIELD and declared that MANSFIELD's integrity had won him the respect from all newspaper correspondents, as well as his colleagues, regardless of party affiliation.

Mrs. Bolle, a librarian, is on the staff of a private law research library in Washington, D.C. The Bolles have a married daughter in the Netherlands, two sons, and seven grandchildren. Their two sons have become American citizens. One is a professor of mathematics at Brown University and the other is on the staff of McCall publications.

Mr. and Mrs. Bolle declared that Senator MANSFIELD expressed surprise they had not previously visited Montana, but prophesied that "they had saved Montana, the best, until the last." They agreed and already are making plans for another visit in 1967, when they plan a vacation trip to Canada.

But, the dividend from their current visit will be the sparks of interest that will be lit up in the Netherlands, particularly by the relatives and acquaintances of Montanans still living there.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERTSON OF VIRGINIA ON HIS BIRTHDAY

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, one of our most distinguished colleagues, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] recently celebrated his birthday. I wish to express belated congratulations to a true statesman and one who is admired for his forthrightness, his unyielding loyalty to his country, and to the good people of Virginia whom he has represented in the Congress for 33 years, first in the House of Representatives, having been elected to the 73d Congress on November 8, 1932, and later elected to the Senate on November 5, 1946. Having represented his constituency so ably, he has been returned to the Senate on three successive occasions and I have no doubt that he will again be returned to this body by a mandate of the people of Virginia next year.

Having had the pleasure to serve the good people of Florida in part in the Senate since 1946, I have been closely aligned with my distinguished colleague on many occasions. Our philosophy and aims follow similar paths. Parenthetically, I might add that Senator ROBERTSON served in World War I, as did the Senator from Florida.

The continued reelection of WILLIS ROBERTSON is indicative of the high esteem the people of Virginia hold for him.

Mr. President, those who knew WILLIS ROBERTSON prior to his election to the Congress also hold him in high esteem, be they Virginians or be they in one of the other 49 States.

I recently received a letter from Mr. Max Fleischer of the St. Petersburg Isaac Walton League, who knows of the fine work that WILLIS ROBERTSON accomplished when he was Commissioner of Game and Inland Fisheries in the Commonwealth of Virginia in the late twenties and early thirties.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this splendid letter printed in the RECORD.